263 1434 1422 1398 Nov
T: Gorkha land Agitation
A: INDIA
ಪರಾಮರ್ಶನ ಗ್ರಂಥ
Acc. No: 107857
ಅಕ್ಷರ ಗ್ರಂಥಾಲಯ
ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯ, ಹಂಪಿ
ವಿದ್ಯಾರಣ್ಯ
954.14 IND

सत्यमेव जयते

GOVERNMENT OF WEST BENGAL

ಗ್ರಂಥಾಲಯ
ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯ, ಹಂಪಿ
ವಿದ್ಯಾರಣ್ಯ.

[redacted]

GORKHALAND AGITATION

THE ISSUES

An Information Document

AKSHARA GRANTHALAYA
ACC.NO. 107857

ಎಸ್.ಎಸ್. ಹಿರೇಮಠ
ನಿವೃತ್ತ ಪ್ರಾಧ್ಯಾಪಕರು
ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ

GOVERNMENT OF WEST BENGAL

954.14
IND

107857

CONTENTS

		Page
INTRODUCTION	.. ..	v
I.	A socio-economic profile of the Darjeeling Hill area	1
II.	A historical outline of the migratory movements	4
III.	The GNLF—the political-ideological basis	7
IV.	The 'Gorkhaland' agitation	12
V.	The main issues raised by GNLF	17
VI.	National issues	22
VII.	The standpoint of the government of West Bengal	24

Appendices

A.	GNLF memorandum to the King of Nepal, dated 23.12.1983	31
B.	The speech of Subhas Gheising, dated 2.6.1985	34
C.	W. B. Official Language Act of 1961	40
D.	All-party resolution on Gorkhaland agitation, dated 18.8.1986 ..	42
E.	Indo-Nepal Treaty of 1950	44
F.	Linguistic breakdown of the population of Darjeeling and breakdown of Nepali population in India	47
G.	Selected Indicators of Development for Darjeeling and other North Bengal districts	48
H.	Population growth in Darjeeling: 1891-1981	49
I.	The deed of grant by the Raja of Sikkim making over Darjeeling to the East India Company, 1st February, 1835	50

INTRODUCTION

This document deals with the issues which have arisen in connection with the agitation for a separate state of "Gorkhaland". It also deals with the stated objectives, programmes and actions of the Gorkha National Liberation Front (GNLF), which is leading this agitation, and its consequences—economic, social and political, including those relating to the broader issues of national unity—for the Nepali-speaking population in Darjeeling and elsewhere—for the state of West Bengal and for the country as a whole. It is the view of the government of West Bengal that this movement is anti-national and secessionist in its objective, and has already inflicted a great deal of harm to the economy and social life of the hill areas of Darjeeling, to the ordinary day-to-day existence of the population in the hills, and to the excellent record of communal relations about which the people of the state of West Bengal, irrespective of their religion, language and ethnic identity, are justifiably proud. The main objective in publishing this paper is to set out in detail the essential facts and information relating to this agitation, so that the people of the state of West Bengal, and elsewhere in India, can form their own opinion on the basis of those, in place of half-truths and zero-truths emanating from various sources which are, directly, indirectly or unwittingly, encouraging this agitation.

I. A SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROFILE OF THE DARJEELING HILL AREA

We begin our account with a brief economic and social profile of the three hill sub-divisions of the district of Darjeeling. The peaceful Himalayan region of West Bengal, with a Nepalese majority, is largely known for its tea gardens and scenic beauty and is a major tourist attraction in the country. Tea, Tourism and Timber, the three Ts form the backbone of the hill economy. The topography in the hills does not favour the development of a highly productive agriculture, though the hardworking local farmers try to make the most of the difficult terrain. Horticulture and animal husbandry have better prospects. The state government has already set up a fruit processing plant in Matigara, to facilitate the marketing of the produce at a reasonable price. The area is also known for a wide range of medicinal plants, which are exported to other countries, and form the raw material of the growing phytochemical industry of the state. As for animal husbandry, the hill area of the district has the largest proportion of high-breed cattles in the state, and particular attention is given to the development of the animal wealth of the area and also its fodder, knowing that this can provide an important source of livelihood to a large section of the rural population in the hills. The forests, as elsewhere in the country, are suffering from a high rate of depletion, giving rise to serious ecological problems, in addition to reducing the stock of one of the principal resources in this region. The state government is aware of this; a beginning has been made with extensive programmes of water-shed planning, afforestation and soil conservation to halt such process with the help of the local panchayets.

Of 2,41,725 hectares of geographical area in the hills of Darjeeling, about 54 per cent is covered by forests, another 14 per cent is devoted to agriculture, while tea and cinchona plantations account for 6·62 and 10·75 per cents of land, respectively. Between 1971 and 1981, according to the census authorities, the area under the forest and the area covered by agriculture and cinchona plantations have remained more or less the same, while the area under tea gardens has shrunk from 7·45 per cent of the total area to 6·62 per cent, but the area covered by irrigation has increased from 25 per cent to 27 per cent of the net sown area. The census data further show that approximately one-third of the total working population are engaged in agricultural activities, about one-third are engaged in activities connected with plantations, orchards, forestry and livestock, another 8 per cent are engaged as agricultural labourers, while the rest of the workers are involved with manufacturing, construction, mining, trading and various service activities. Compared with the figures for the rest of West Bengal, the proportion of non-agriculturists is much higher. The proportion of workers in the total population, at 35·33 per cent is low, but higher than the state average of 30·22 per cent.

In 1984-85 tourism yielded an income of Rs. 23 crores, forest products yielded Rs. 7 crores, cinchona Rs. 2·43 crores, while tea production of 12 million kgs accounted for

Rs. 32 crores. The milk production of 82 million tons has been considerably boosted by the setting up of large Himul Dairy in Matigara, while the meat production of 10·5 million kilograms and egg production of 16 million is considerably higher on a per capita basis than the figures for the rest of the state.

Like the rest of West Bengal, or of India, the majority of the people in the hills of Darjeeling are poor, and their basic needs of food, shelter, clothing and jobs are far from satisfied. But, comparison of the figures for Hill Darjeeling with those for the rest of the state conclusively shows that there is no evidence that this area is more backward or has been discriminated against in terms of allocation of resources. On the contrary, taking the whole of the state of West Bengal into account, despite the poverty in the hills, its position appears to be better than the average in the rest of the state, and decidedly better than the conditions in any other North Bengal district or any district on the western part of the state—that is Purulia, Bankura, Birbhum or Midnapore. In terms of per capita income, its position is fourth among the 16 districts of the state, coming after Calcutta, Howrah and Burdwan, and in terms of urbanisation (including the plains with Siliguri city) it ranks after the Calcutta Metropolitan district and the Burdwan district. In terms of unemployment, whereas the proportion of registered unemployed to the total population in the state is around 7·82 per cent, in case of Darjeeling hills, the proportion of unemployed is 8·29 per cent, which is slightly higher than the state average. On the other hand, the unemployed in the hills of Darjeeling have a much higher chance of placement than their counterparts in the plains: while average placement for the state as a whole is 3·30 per thousand of live register in employment exchange, in case of Darjeeling sub-division it is 19·3, and in cases of Kurseong and Kalimpong around 13·0.

Over the years Darjeeling hill areas have been earmarked as priority areas for development. In 1984-85 the per capita plan expenditure in Darjeeling was Rs. 423, compared to the state average of Rs. 124. The aggregate amount of capital expenditure in the hills under the plan was Rs. 24·76 crores in 1985-86. A separate department of Hill Affairs with a Minister operates from Darjeeling as its headquarter, while the Hill Development Council, chaired by the Chief Minister, regularly meets to decide on plan allocations. Apart from the need to protect forests from depletion, and to maintain the production in the tea gardens, attempts are being made to diversify the local economy through intensified efforts in tourism, animal husbandry and small industries development. A programme for subsidies of transport expenses has been in operation for some time to facilitate the marketing of hill products, while all the three major towns in the hills—Darjeeling, Kurseong and Kalimpong—have been given specialised attention in the programmes on urban development. Provision of drinking water, and improvement of health and educational facilities are also being geared up.

The importance of Siliguri, located on the plains of Darjeeling, the largest urban centre in North Bengal, is largely derived from its proximity to Darjeeling hills, its trade in timber, tea and tourism, and the transport needs. A major railway junction, Siliguri provides the living link between the hills and the plains, and its university, medical institutions, and other facilities cater to various needs of the hill area. The symbiotic relationship between these two areas is emphasised by its timber industry, tea auction centre and road-

rail linkages. These two economies are closely integrated also in terms of the provisions supplied through Siliguri to the hills. Last year 24,000 tons of rice, 25,000 tons of wheat, 4,500 tons of sugar, 11,000 kilolitres of kerosene and 15,000 tons of soft and hard coke reached the hills by way of Siliguri, which met some of the basic requirements of the hill population.

In Appendix G we are presenting comparative figures on a selected number of development indicators for Darjeeling district along with those for the other North Bengal districts, as also the average figure for the entire state. These are the indicators which are covered by the Economic Review of the government of West Bengal. These show that in terms of most such indicators Darjeeling's performance is better than the state average, and much better than that for any other North Bengal district. Besides, for those indicators for which the district share of the West Bengal aggregate is given, Darjeeling accounts for a higher share than what its population proportion in the total population of the state deserves. This is particularly the case with the provision of banking facilities, medical institutions, cross-bred cattle, milk production, and the holding of licenses for radio. In case of television, the share is much less than its population share, but considerably higher than that for other North Bengal districts. In terms of both agricultural and non-agricultural enterprises, the share is higher than the population share in the state, while in terms of literacy rate Darjeeling is miles ahead of the other North Bengal districts and performs better than the average for the state. Darjeeling's weak point is agriculture, as a comparatively much smaller proportion of the total area is available for cultivation, but in view of the engagement of a high proportion of workers in non-agricultural activities, the amount of land available per 'agricultural worker' (that is cultivator and agricultural labourer combined) is higher than the state average, though lower than the figure for other North Bengal districts excepting Malda. It is also seen that between 1971-72 and 1982-83, Darjeeling has increased agricultural production much faster than any other North Bengal district and the average figure for the entire state. These figures are given to set the level of development in Darjeeling in a proper perspective within the context of the development of the state economy and of North Bengal as a whole.

II. A HISTORICAL OUTLINE OF THE MIGRATORY MOVEMENTS

In view of the misunderstandings and confusions which are being deliberately created regarding the history of the region and the migratory movements, we are setting out below a brief outline of the history based on official sources.

Historically, what is known as the district of Darjeeling today was parts of two kingdoms during the pre-British period—the kingdoms of Sikkim and Bhutan. Following wars and treaties signed with these two kingdoms, this territory came under the control of the British Empire in India. This territory was not a part of Nepal when the British took over, and, therefore, cannot be considered as a part of the 'ceded territories' of Nepal, as is being claimed by GNLF.

The present territory of Darjeeling came under British occupation during the nineteenth century in three stages. In 1835, by a deed of grant signed on 1st February, the Raja of Sikkim ceded a portion of the hills to the British to help them to set up a sanatorium. This area covered all the land south of the Great Rangit river, east of Balasan, Kahel and Little Rangit rivers and west of the Rangnu and Mahananda rivers. The second stage followed war with Sikkim, which resulted in the annexation of 'Sikkim Morang' or 'Terai' at the foot of the hills, and a portion of the Sikkim hills bounded by the Rammam rivers on the north, by the Great Rangit and the Teesta on the east and by the Nepal frontier on the west. This area too had always been under Sikkim, excepting the Morang or Terai in the foot-hills which was for a time (1788-1816) conquered and ruled by Nepal, but, following the war with Nepal during 1814-16 this tract was ceded to the British Government which in turn returned it to the Raja of Sikkim. The third stage was marked by a war between British India and Bhutan, which led in 1864 to the annexation of the hill tract to the east of Teesta, west of Ne-chu and De-chu rivers and south of Sikkim.

In other words, the present territory of Darjeeling historically belonged to Sikkim and Bhutan, and were included in India following wars and agreement with these two countries. Only the Terai part of the territory (and not the hills) was for a time conquered by Nepal from Sikkim, but was then returned to Sikkim in 1816, long before the district of Darjeeling took shape. As for the hill areas of the present-day Darjeeling, where the Nepali-speaking population constitute the overwhelming majority, there is no recorded historical evidence of this ever being part of Nepal.

Furthermore, the native population of the district did not comprise of the population of Nepali origin. Both the Nepalis and the Bengalis came to the territory as immigrants following the development of the tea industry and the expansion of the administration.

To quote the Bengal District Gazetteers, authored by Arthur Jules Dash and published by the British Government of Bengal (1947 edition, Darjeeling part, Chapter III):

> "When the East India Company in 1835 first acquired the nucleus of the Darjeeling district from the Raja of Sikkim, it was almost entirely under forest and practically uninhabited...this hill tract of 138 square miles contained a population of 100.
>
> "The decision of the Company to develop Darjeeling as a hill resort gave the opportunity to neighbouring peoples to immigrate and take part in the development. The original inhabitants, probably Lepchas, were rapidly outnumbered by settlers from Nepal and Sikkim. By the year 1850, Dr. Campbell, the first superintendent reported that the number of inhabitants had risen to 10,000. The rapid influx was noted by Sir Joseph Hocker when he visited Darjeeling about that time. When in 1869 a rough census was taken of the inhabitants of this tract, the total was found to be over 22,000."

Thus it was overwhelmingly a forest land by 1869, with a population of not more than 22,000. However, by the time of the first census of India in 1872, the population had rapidly increased to 94,712, and by the turn of the century, in 1901 it was 2,49,117. This increase was mainly connected with the development of tea industry and the opportunities for wasteland cultivation. The tea plantations, beginning in the 1850s, increased to 74 estates covering 14,000 acres in 1872, 153 estates and 30,000 acres in 1881, and 177 estates and 45,000 acres in 1891. While the labourers for the tea estates in the Terai plains were mostly tribals from Bihar, in the hills the great majority of the workers were from Nepal. Once the tea industry developed, this led to further economic activities and created demand for more immigrants, many of whom now took to agriculture. The migration from Nepal continued in subsequent years. Even in 1931, out of a total population of 3,19,635, 59,016 had come from Nepal, in addition to the vast number of offsprings from the earlier waves of migration from Nepal, who constituted the majority. By 1941, 86·8 per cent of the population in the three hill sub-divisions of Darjeeling were Nepali-speaking, while other hillmen and scheduled castes constituted another 8·1 per cent.

To quote from W. W. Hunter's authoritative account (A Statistical Account of Bengal, Volume X, London, 1876):

> "The Lepchas are considered to be the aboriginal inhabitants of the hilly portion of the district. At all events they are the first known occupiers of this tract and of independent Sikkim."

Regarding the Nepalis, who constituted 34 per cent of the population of the district by 1876, while the majority of the population in the district were non-Nepalese, Hunter's account stated:

> "The Nepalese, who form 34 per cent of the population of the district, are all immigrants from the state of Nepal to the westward. They are a pushing, thriving

race, and the Deputy Commissioner is of opinion that they will in time occupy the whole district."

According to Hunter, even by 1876, "the population of the district is entirely rural," and even Darjeeling and Kurseong had populations less than 5,000. But in subsequent years the population of Darjeeling grew, thanks to the support given by the British as a health resort for the Europeans, from 3,157 in 1872 to 7,018 in 1881, 14,145 in 1891, and 16,924 in 1901.

This historical account is given to make the point that the development of the hill area of Darjeeling has been largely the outcome of activities relating to tea and tourist industries over the past one hundred years or so, before which it was sparsely populated, and the people of Nepali origin constituting the vast majority of the population there now came as immigrants from Nepal. There is, therefore, no historical validity in claiming this as a part of the territory ceded by the Government of Nepal to the British Empire in India.

Nor is this proper to view the growth of population in the hills in isolation from the developments in the plains, where too the forest lands were cleared to set up plantations and migrant labourers were brought in for work in tea gardens and associated activities. As in the case of Darjeeling hills, the towns in Jalpaiguri and Siliguri sub-division largely owe their origin to tea industry, but whereas in Darjeeling the migrant labourers were mostly from Nepal, in the plains they were mostly recruited from the tribal areas of Bihar. In addition the Bengalis were brought in for clerical and administrative work and for various professional activities. After the partition of the country, in 1947, a large number of refugees from East Pakistan came to this area.

Until the recent happenings, the four major communities in the hills and plains of Darjeeling district—the Nepalis, the Tribals, the Bengalis, and the original inhabitants (Mech, Rajbansi, Lepcha, Bhutia etc.)—lived peacefully and amicably. There had been no instance of any major communal tension between these communities, and the law and order situation was normal. Nor had there been instances of serious confrontation between a section of the population and the police and civil authorities.

The Nepali community, of hardworking peasants toiling on a difficult terrain, devoted industrial workers in the tea gardens and valiant soldiers earning distinction in many wars, had no difficulty in working side by side with the Bengalis, the tribals, and other Indians. The atmosphere in the hills of Darjeeling was in keeping with the excellent tradition of communal harmony in the rest of the state. The so-called 'Gorkhaland agitation' is now striking at the root of such communal harmony, by preaching hatred, by using emotive expressions such as 'genocide and apartheid' and by adopting violent means to achieve their ends.

III. THE GNLF—THE POLITICAL-IDEOLOGICAL BASIS

Separatist movements of various colour and objectives have been known in the hill areas for quite some time. Prantiya Parishad, a separatist movement of older vintage than GNLF, gave call for boycotting elections in the past, but without much impact on the electorate. Politically, the three main political parties active in the hills of Darjeeling from the early days were Communist Party of India (Marxist) (and, before 1964, Communist Party of India), Congress(I) (Indian National Congress before the split) and All-India Gorkha League. In the 1982 state assembly elections out of three seats two went to CPI(M), and one to Gorkha League. In 1984 parliamentary election the only seat was won by CPI(M) candidate Ananda Pathak, but Dawa Norbulla of Congress(I) and Siddhartha Ray, the present governor of Punjab who contested as independent, also secured sizeable votes. Even by early 1986, the separatists were a minor force in the hills and had limited influence on the politics of the area.

There can be no doubt that the serious deterioration in communal relationship in the rest of the country, particularly in Punjab and Assam, and the rise of separatism in different parts of the country, particularly in Tripura, Mizoram and other areas in the North-East over the past two years, had a significant bearing on the development of communal and separatist feelings in the hill areas of Darjeeling. The accords signed by the central government with the separatist forces helped to confer some legitimacy on these movements and created expectations that, given time, such forces anywhere would be able to extract major concessions from the national government, only if they showed determination and managed to mobilise a section of the population in their support. In particular, the negotiations and eventual signing of accord with the erstwhile secessionist leader Laldenga, which led to his installation as Chief Minister, had a snowballing effect, as also the earlier creation of a Nepali-majority state with a small population of three lakhs in neighbouring Sikkim.

One of the immediate issues, which was seized upon by the separatists, was the expulsion of a few hundred Nepali citizens from Meghalaya, where they were working in Jowai hills coalmines, on the ground that they did not possess necessary entry permits. It was alleged that the central government did not restrain the government of Meghalaya from undertaking such expulsion without cause. This was highlighted by secessionists as an illustration of the insecurity and helplessness of all Nepalis—whether citizens of India or Nepal—in India. In the campaign the West Bengal government too was criticised for not providing shelter to the expelled Nepalese from Meghalaya; but what this campaign deliberately omitted to mention was that the victims of such expulsion themselves desired to return to Nepal when passing through West Bengal, and necessary arrangements for this were undertaken by the state government. Nor did such campaign among the Nepali population in Darjeeling indicate that it was the government of West Bengal which protested against such expulsion in no uncertain terms and that it had also protested against similar

expulsion by the government of Assam earlier. Besides, West Bengal has, for a long time, been a secure place for the minorities of all types—linguistic, religious or ethnic—and has been remarkably free from communal tensions of the kind which are part of the day-to-day life in many states of India. The relationship between the Nepalis and the majority of the Bengali community had always been exceptionally good based as it was on mutual trust and affection.

The Gorkha National Liberation Front (GNLF), led by Subhas Gheising, a former army officer and for a time a political activist in a trade union organisation associated with Congress(I), came into being on 30th July, 1980. One of its first acts was to put up posters in Darjeeling town which said: "We are stateless. We are constitutionally tortured all over India. We want our own administration, return our land from Bengal. Our future is in great danger. It is better to die than live as a slave. All are requested to fight for Gorkhaland." This inflammatory tone was typical of the propaganda conducted by GNLF over the next six years.

In the earlier part of the campaign the demand was for a separate state comprising the three hill sub-divisions—Darjeeling, Kurseong and Kalimpong—of the district, but soon the area to be incorporated in proposed Gorkhaland extended to the rest of Darjeeling, and a sizeable part of the Himalayan foot-hills, including a chunk of Jalpaiguri and Cooch-Bihar districts, and even parts of Bihar and Assam, oblivious of the fact that the Nepali-speaking population are a small minority in those areas. In the earlier statements the demand amounted to a separate state outside the framework of the Indian state, but in recent months this has been modified to a demand for statehood within India as a tactical move. The option of regional autonomy within the state of West Bengal, as proposed by the government of West Bengal, has been rejected by them, as also the option propagated by a section of Congress(I) for giving the Darjeeling hill areas the status of a union territory.

One of the earliest documents setting out the views of GNLF was the memorandum submitted to the King of Nepal, dated 23.12.1983, copies of which were circulated to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and the governments of the following countries: United States, USSR, France, India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, China, Great Britain, Nepal, and also to a number of prominent political personalities of Nepal. The facts that the memorandum was addressed to a monarch of another sovereign state, and that its copies were sent to the United Nations and heads of various states, clearly point to the secessionist character of the movement (Appendix A). The document, written in garbled English, is not easy to read, but some of the points raised in it deserve attention:

(*i*) The impression created by the momorandum, that the areas comprising Darjeeling today were ceded by the Nepal government to British India under an international agreement, is at variance with the recorded history of the region. We have already noted in Section II that this area was never a part of Nepal.

(*ii*) Its talk about "apartheid and genocide crimes done by the state and central governments of India since Bharat Independence" is not backed by any docu-

mentation, and flies in the face of known cordial relationship between the Indians of Nepali origin and other Indians until the GNLF campaign. This shows that this organisation is bent on inflamming passion and hatred on the basis of imagined injustices.

(*iii*) The criticism of the British government for "having decided only the fate and fortune of the Hindus and Muslims of Indian origin by creating separate independent countries of Bharat and Pakistan," while the "Gorkhas and their ceded land and territories were left at the cross roads," and "the past treaties and agreement of the then British government and Nepal" remained neither revoked nor suspended, and thus the "future status of the ethnic Gorkhas" remained unconfirmed, clearly show that the authors of the memorandum were seeking an independent land outside India for the Nepalis, which they claimed to be a part of the territory ceded by Nepal to Britain under various treaties. There are also references to 'vivisected Nepal' in the document. The memorandum also took the view that it was "unjustifiable" on the part of the British government not to organise a "plebiscite" to decide whether the area should be handed over to India or Nepal. The inference to be drawn from the memorandum is that the British, rather than leaving the territory as part of India, should have either organised a plebiscite to decide whether the people there chose to live in India or Nepal, or should have revoked the treaties with Nepal and, presumably, returned those territories to Nepal.

(*iv*) The consequence of the British decision to leave Darjeeling with India, for the Nepalis of Indian origin, according to this memorandum, was "that the Gorkhas were perpetually subjected to fight the wars of other countries by losing everything of their own national identity, political safeguard, and their historical homeland and destiny." In other words, to enlist in the Indian army amounted to "fighting wars of other countries". The document also referred to the principle of self-determination voiced by Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States in 1919, with reference to the countries under colonial subjugation, and also the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations in 1948. This reference carried the implication that the Nepalis of Indian origin were under colonial domination and should be given freedom and their own homeland. This should leave no one in doubt that what the authors of this document are seeking is not merely statehood within India, but the status of an independent country.

(*v*) Finally, the document appeals to the King of Nepal, and not to the government of India which is only given a copy of the memorandum, for the abrogation of the treaties signed between India, Nepal and Britain, and to "adopt afresh a new treaties for a permanent political settlement of the said victimised Gorkhas as per mentioned in the provisions of the Charter of United Nations and also confirm accordingly the future status of their ceded land." It needs no emphasis that the creation of a new state within the framework of the Indian constitution hardly justifies the intervention of the United Nations, or reference to the historically untenable 'ceded land' of Nepal.

A delegation led by Gheising went to Nepal on 15.2.1984, and is reported to have met the Home Minister of Nepal. Earlier, a former minister of Nepal, Hrishikesh Shaw, had visited Darjeeling and had issued a statement supporting the demand for Gorkhaland. In 1984, during the parliamentary elections, GNLF gave call for the boycott of election, which was ignored by the electorate. But in early 1985—from March 12 to March 18—another delegation led by Gheising went to Nepal and submitted copies of the 1983 memorandum to the embassies of USA, USSR, France, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Bhutan and UK located in Kathmandu. By July, 1985 the youth and student wings of GNLF had been formed, and by August, 1985, cassettes of a speech made by Gheising at Kurseong on 2.6.85 had been put into circulation. On 10.8.85, about 50 members of the youth wing of GNLF took oath at Mahakaldara, Darjeeling that they would fight until the realisation of their demand for Gorkhaland. This was the beginning of a series of such oath-taking ceremonies, which were supposed to bind for ever the religious minded Nepalis to the cause of Gorkhaland. On that day, for the first time, they took out a procession in Darjeeling where they displayed their naked *kukris*. Commitment to their cause thus became inextricably mixed with commitments to religion and violent means to achieve their end, as symbolised by the naked *kukri*.

In the speech of second June, 1985, Gheising said that none of the Indian governments—from Nehru to Rajiv Gandhi—did do any justice to the Nepalis (Appendix B). Here, though Gheising said that he did not want to get separated from India, but was demanding a separate identity and a separate state within the Indian Union, in the same breath, he lamented that "we have been trapped in this country," and added "I like to repeat the past history—India cannot decide the fate of all Gorkhas." He then criticised the British for making Darjeeling hills a part of West Bengal, and the All-India Gorkha League for acquiescing. He also referred to the demand for the inclusion of the area in Nepal, and also the argument given by Balkishen Sam, dramatist, against such proposal, that it would bring Indian influence to Nepal. He added, "In 1947, we could not get our province (Darjeeling), and Nepal government also did not take this land. This land remained neglected. The Britishers left India in 1947 without a plebiscite." He continued: "After 1947, we became the domiciled citizens, but what about this land? How this land went to Bengal and Bharat?" Then, again, while reiterating that he wanted to remain outside Bengal but within India, he referred to the possibility of Nepal claiming Darjeeling as a part of its territory once the Indo-Nepal Treaty was abrogated. He asked: "What will be the result of the matter being raised in UNO after the rejection of all treaties?" Curiously, he then proceeded to demand the abrogation of the Indo-Nepal Treaty of 1950. After a series of such self-contradictory statements, Gheising argued: "Today, everywhere in the world many tiny countries are being created as 'Micro-State', whose population are 57 thousand, 70 thousand only. The UNO is recognising these countries as separate countries, like China, Sicily, Congo etc. The population of these countries is only 70 thousand. For the UN membership, there is need of only 55,000 dollars, to be paid yearly. So if the 'Gorkhaland' could not be created, there is possibility of something happening in near future." In this speech Gheising seemed to put a great deal of trust on the United Nations and the government of Nepal for redressing the grievances of the Nepalis of Darjeeling. Ignoring the fact that Sicily is not an independent country, and that none of these places including Taiwan (if this is what he means by China) is tiny and contains a much larger population than the figures suggested by him, the main

thrust of the speech is clear--that is to create an independent state of Gorkhaland, or to make it a part of Nepal.

This speech also strongly criticised the Indo-Nepal Treaty of 1950, about which more will be said in another part of the paper. What is important to note is that this speech forms the ideological basis of the agitation, and has been circulated in thousands by way of cassettes among the Nepali-speaking population in Darjeeling.

IV. THE 'GORKHALAND' AGITATION

On 13.3.86, in a meeting held in Ghoom, at the hall of Bharat Dong, GNLF decided on the following eleven-point programme of action:

(*i*) To observe a 'Black Flag Day' on 13.4.86 in protest against alleged atrocities and discrimination perpetrated on the Indian Nepalis.

(*ii*) To give a 72-hour 'Bundh' call from 12th to 14th May, 1986 to highlight the constitutional and just demand for "Gorkhaland".

(*iii*) In 1955, the States Re-organisation Committee had increased the area of West Bengal allegedly by unconstitutionally annexing the areas of Darjeeling, Kurseong, Kalimpong, Mirik, Siliguri and Dooars which have different culture and language. The party will burn the said report of the States Re-organisation Committee.

(*iv*) According to the party, Article 7 of the Indo-Nepal Treaty of 1950 has relegated the Indian Nepalis to status of immigrants. The party will burn Article 7 of the said Treaty.

(*v*) The party will launch a movement against the indiscriminate felling of the trees of the hill areas by the Forest Corporation for sending them to the plains.

(*vi*) The party will continue vote boycott movement with the slogan "We will not stay in the other people's State of West Bengal."

(*vii*) The party will boycott all MLAs, Ministers and parties, who are against the demand for "Gorkhaland".

(*viii*) Over the demand for "Gorkhaland" and in protest against the policies of the central government the party will launch a movement by way of stopping all vehicles taking the valuable boulders of Dudhia (P.S. Kurseong) towards the plains.

(*ix*) To launch a "Do or die" movement in protest against the alleged treatment of the Gorkhas as domiciles.

(*x*) The Gorkhas of Darjeeling and the plains will not observe or celebrate the 15th August, 26th January, Gandhi Jayanti, Netaji Jayanti and other National Celebrations until and unless the government of India concedes the demand for Gorkhaland.

(*xi*) In protest against the alleged colonial attitude towards the Gorkhas by the government of India, the party decided to organise a movement for non-payment of taxes and loans.

In accordance with this programme a meeting was held in Kalimpong stadium on 29.3.86, where the supporters of GNLF displayed *kukri*, and then on 13th April another public meeting was called in Darjeeling, where about 3,500 people attended. In both the meetings Gheising made speeches more or less on the line of the speech outlined above, tried to rouse ethnic passion and hinted at the adoption of violent means to achieve their end. On 4th May, about 30 supporters of GNLF drew blood from their thumbs with *kukri* to write a poster in blood demanding Gorkhaland.

This was followed by a three-day bundh observed at the call of GNLF from May 12 to May 14. Shop-keepers and public servants were terrorised to keep their shutters down and stay at home, while road blocks were placed to halt the traffic. In several places nails were placed on the road, or the surface was covered with mobil oil in order to immobilise the traffic. Wherever the ordinary people resisted such demand, violent means was used against them. Two buses of North Bengal State Transport were damaged, and several policemen were injured in the incident. In one case a service revolver was snatched from a constable. At Panihata, under Naxalbari P.S., a police outpost was attacked, which led to police firing and the death of one person. One Additional Police Superintendent was injured in this incident. The Garidhura police outpost was also under attack from a large mob. On the first day of the bundh only 15 of the tea gardens were closed, while the rest 70 were functioning; but concerted intimidation led to an increase in the number of closed gardens to 40 by the third day. In general, the workers of tea gardens in the hills, overwhelmingly Nepali-speaking, were reluctant to join the bundh.

107857

The next serious incident happened in Kurseong, on 25th May, when about 600 people, carrying deadly weapons, came to Motor Stand in six trucks from Tindharia and Mahanadi, demanding release of persons arrested following road blocks. Eventually their number swelled to 2,500, and, despite the declaration by the SDO that the mob was unlawful and that they should disperse, they began throwing bombs and brickbats at the police party, injuring SDO, CI and 15 other policemen, as well as two CRP personnel. When tear-gassing and lathi-charge failed to disperse or to stop them from attacking the police party, the SDO ordered firing, which led to five deaths and injury to two others. This was followed by the imposition of curfew, for the first time in the hills of Darjeeling in its whole history, and an undeclared bundh in the three hill sub-divisions of the district on the following three days. The government arranged for the evacuation of 3,000 stranded tourists from Darjeeling.

On 25th May, before the Kurseong firing, posters appeared in different parts of Darjeeling, making the following appeal to the Gorkha soldiers:

> "Brave Gorkha soldiers protecting India—hear the news of Darjeeling. Central government has deployed CRPF personnel in Darjeeling to kill our brothers and sisters, destroy houses and properties and have arrested many of our innocent people

and sent them to the plains. Please quit the army at once, save our lives and fight CRPF—Your Relatives."

In a leaflet issued anonymously more or less at the same time, the following appeal was made:

"We also make an appeal to the persons who are serving in Gorkha regiment—how long you will fight for others ? Our own kith and kin have been killed while you are fighting for others. Your daughters and sisters have been raped, your minor child became an orphan, being motherless, your brother who had been guarding your house has become victim of the bullets of CRP for the sake of his land. So, take a decision today, otherwise, when you will be retired tomorrow then you may be treated as a foreigner."

Thus, not only the serving soldiers were asked to rebel, in various statements and speeches people were incited to adopt violent means—by constant reference to *kukri,* need for bloodshed, and oath-taking with blood in Mahakal temple in the name of religion. In his speech Gheising also referred to blood-stained *kukris* being washed by the army of Nepal in river Teesta after a war with an Indian King. In another statement GNLF declared: "We will fight unto death. If CRPF is used to contain the movement, we will unsheath our *kukris* and behead them." Constant reference was made to former army men, and several of whom form the inner core of the movement today. Reports of training being given in archery and bomb-making came from some parts of the district. A great deal of comings and goings between Darjeeling, Nepal and Sikkim were reported, while considerable amount of money flowed in to pay daily allowances to the volunteers. In the meetings organised by GNLF people from across the border with Nepal were also brought. GNLF receipts, charging Rs. 11 per head were issued, and people were coerced to contribute to their funds. In addition, cassettes of speeches by Gheising and Gorkhaland calendars were sold to mobilise funds. There were also reports of some youths receiving guerilla training, and foreign funds and expertise making their way to Darjeeling. This atmosphere of violence, terror and intimidation forced the district authorities to declare order under section 144 Cr.P.C. in major towns, while GNLF declared a four-point programme for July and August in the second phase of the agitation:

(*i*) to burn copies of the Indo-Nepal Treaty on 27.7.86.

(*ii*) to boycott the National Day on 15th August and hoist black flag.

(*iii*) to declare a 108-hour bundh in hill areas.

(*iv*) to launch a rasta-roko agitation from 23rd August to stop forest products reaching the plains.

The next major incident took place on 27th July, at Kalimpong, on the first day of the new phase of the agitation when a large mob collected at the periphery of the town with *kukri* and attempted to march to the centre. When they were dispersed by the police, they

regrouped in the Mela ground and on the road in front of the Kalimpong police station. Then they proceeded to attack the police station and the personnel inside. One policeman was knifed to death, another was hit in the neck by *kukri* and became severely injured, both arms of another policeman was nearly chopped off, while the DIG of police was repeatedly stabbed and 25 policemen were injured. In this situation the police fired in self-defence, killing 13 and injuring another 38. This incident, again, was used by GNLF to declare another bundh for three days.

The next programme, of boycotting the National Day celebration and hoisting black flag, was postponed and all the agitations were suspended for a month, on the eve of that programme, after Gheising's visit to Delhi. Gheising is claiming to have met leaders of some "Non-Congress non-Communist parties" in their offices who, according to him, advised him against observing this programme but at the same time assured him help. The leaders of Janata, Lok Dal and other parties have categorically denied this, and have openly declared their opposition to the demand for Gorkhaland. However, some supporters of GNLF are spreading a story that Gheising met some emissaries of the central government, who advised caution but at the same time pledged sympathetic consideration of the demand. In any case, since then Gheising and GNLF have been strongly protesting their patriotic commitment to India and have been asserting that their demand is for a separate state within India. The statement of Arjun Singh, Vice-President of Congress(I), that their movement is not 'anti-national' is being extensively displayed in posters and has been circulated by way of leaflets throughout the hills.

Meanwhile, attack on those opposing the demand for Gorkhaland has been mounted. Their houses are being ransacked, they are being mercilessly beaten up, and, holding the *kukri* at their neck, they are being intimidated into giving the slogan "Jai Gorkha", and in some cases are being dragged to Mahakal temple for taking the oath of allegiance in the name of Gorkhaland. Those not contributing funds, or not buying calendars or cassettes are also being similarly intimidated and harassed. In some places boycotts are being organised against those opposing the demand, to beat them to submission. Besides, a series of organised and violent attacks are being organised against the workers of tea gardens, to force them to concede the demand for Gorkhaland. Truckloads of GNLF supporters with deadly weapons are surrounding the tea garden, combing each house, apprehending CITU supporters, terrorising and manhandling them, destroying their properties and houses and otherwise torturing them. Wherever the tea garden workers are resisting, violent clashes are taking place leading to deaths. So far four members of CITU have been killed in such violent confrontations. Even the house of Ananda Pathak, M.P., was raided and put to fire on 7th August, 1986. The GNLF supporters feel that, once the resistance of the tea garden workers is crushed, there would be no organised opposition to their demands.

At the same time, in their propaganda, all kinds of promises are being made. It is being said that, with the formation of Gorkhaland all the unemployed would get jobs, and all those who are employed would get promotion. A 40,000 strong Gorkha army would be created where everyone would be officers, police constables would become police inspectors and writers of high standing would be given Rs. one lakh as reward. In the new state there would be 65 MLAs in place of the present 3, and 4 MPs in place of 1 now, and several

ಎಸ್.ಎಸ್. ಹಿರೇಮಠ
ನಿವೃತ್ತ ಪ್ರಾಂಶುಪಾಲರು
ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ

ministers. Gheising mentioned all these amid thunderous cheers in a meeting at Ghoom on 12.7.86. A new university and a medical institution would be created—all of which would meet the aspirations of a section of the middle class. In these statements what is missing is the programme which would make it possible for GNLF to realise those promises. However, even these incredible promises are being believed by a section of the youth, who are putting their trust on GNLF and Subhas Gheising.

Here too, as on other issues, the position of GNLF is far from consistent. While, on the one hand, such economic issues are being raised, on the other, Gheising himself, on several occasions, has reiterated that his fight is for land and it has no economic content. In a recent interview, published on 16th August, 1986, Gheising admitted: "We are not quarrelling with West Bengal. Neither do we have any economic grievances other than those which are common everywhere in the country. Indeed, we are better off than many of the districts in West Bengal." He also added, rejecting the suggestion that Darjeeling hill area should be merged with Sikkim, "If we are to be a part of any other state it is thousand times better to be in West Bengal."

The latest major incident, at the time of completing this document, has been the strike of tea garden workers, called by CITU, AITUC, INTUC and several other trade union organisations on 11th September, which was successfully held despite the strong opposition of GNLF. In all, in 78 per cent of the tea gardens of Darjeeling and Jalpaiguri the strike was successful; and taking only the tea gardens of the Darjeeling hill areas into account, half remained closed on that day. Given the fact that GNLF openly declared that a strike call given by trade unions would not apply to Gorkhaland, it shows that a very large proportion of the Nepali tea garden workers refused to submit to separatist threats.

V. THE MAIN ISSUES RAISED BY GNLF

Having outlined the course of the agitation for Gorkhaland, as also its political-ideological basis as indicated by the speech of Subhas Gheising, let us now examine in detail some of the specific issues which have been raised by the protagonists of the movement.

One of the major issues highlighted by the movement was the implications of Article VII of the Indo-Nepal Treaty of 1950 for the Nepalis of Indian origin (Appendix E). The article is quoted below:

> "The Governments of India and Nepal agree to grant, on a reciprocal basis, to the nationals of one country in the territories of the other the same privileges in the matter of residence, ownership of property, participation in trade and commerce, movement and privileges of similar nature."

A straight forward interpretation is that, when a citizen of Nepal comes to India, he would be given virtually all the rights of Indian citizenship (excepting right to vote); and similarly, an Indian citizen going to Nepal would be given those rights. He would be able to reside, work, buy property, engage in trade and so on, like any Indian citizen.

This is not the only article which refers to the nationals of the two countries. Article VI states:

> "Each Government undertakes, in token of the neighbourly friendship between India and Nepal, to give the nationals of the other, in its territory, national treatment with regard to participation in industrial and economic development of such territory and to the grant of concessions relating to such development."

Taking the two articles together, the objective appears to be to treat the nationals of the other country favourably, and to provide them easy access to most civic facilities. This is not unusual; there are many instances of such reciprocal relationship between neighbouring countries in the World. In this particular case this is no more than reconfirmation of the relationship between the two countries following India's independence and the ending of the rule of Rana in favour of the King in case of Nepal. But Subhas Gheising and GNLF seem to have unearthed some sinister implications even from such innocuous provisions of the Treaty. In the speech referred to above, Gheising asked why the Nepalis living in India should be made a part of this 'reciprocal' arrangement, ignoring the fact that this arrangement applies equally to both the Indians of Nepali origin and other Indians.

The interpretation given by Gheising is that this reciprocal arrangement gives the impression that "We, the Nepalese have come to India after 1950 Treaty as immigrants."

By a curious logic he reached the conclusion, that liberal provisions regarding Nepalese citizens residing in India worked adversely to the interests of the Nepalis with Indian citizenship, since these two categories of Nepalis might be easily mixed up. He concluded that, as long as this Treaty continued "we are not bonafide citizens of India; life and future is not secure for us here." The cause of the Nepalis with Indian citizenship had been greatly "hampered" or "blemished" due to this Treaty, and had been equated with the "domiciles". The solution he suggested was (*a*) abrogation of the Treaty, and (*b*) the creation of Gorkhaland, which would show that "we are not here in India in accordance with the 1950 Indo-Nepal agreement, but we have been here in this land since 12th century."

The campaign conducted on this Treaty, including the burning of the copies of the Treaty, had the effect of making a large number of Nepalese living in India feel insecure. The expulsion of Nepalese from Meghalaya and Assam further played on that fear and anxiety regarding the status of the Nepalis in India, and helped Gheising and GNLF to gather support around them. Yet, there could be no worthwhile reason for such feeling of insecurity from Article VII of the Treaty which, contrary to the impression created by GNLF, makes no reference to the Nepali-speaking population at all, but applies equally to all Indian citizens, Bengalis, Biharis, Punjabis, and Nepalis alike. This Treaty has not stopped a large number of Nepalis from casting their votes in every election, or from contesting in elections in large numbers, thereby asserting their citizenship rights. In 1984 more than 68 per cent of the electorate of Darjeeling voted, which shows that the Nepali-speaking people participated in election and exerted their civic rights. Furthermore, no evidence has been given of cases where a person's interests have been adversely affected simply because he has been confused with the citizens of Nepal.

Their argument that the creation of Gorkhaland would eliminate such feeling of insecurity is even less tenable. The argument that a Bengali is not mixed up with a Bangladeshi because he has a territorial base in West Bengal, makes even less sense after the creation of Sikkim with a large Nepali majority as an Indian state. If the Bengalis can differentiate themselves from Bangladeshis by pointing to the map of West Bengal, the presence of Sikkim on the map of India confirms the existence of Indians of Nepali origin as distinct from the Nepalis with the citizenship of Nepal. Nor can such debate be conducted in isolation from the social and political reality: the fact is that it is easier for minorities of all types to work and reside in West Bengal than to work and reside in practically any other part of the country including Sikkim.

Yet the fact remains that GNLF succeeded in playing on such hypothetical fears of a large number of people, and managed to mobilise them for political action based on such non-issues. What such concept of a 'territorial base' (presumably in addition to Sikkim) fails to note is the implication of their campaign for the vast majority of about 15 lakh Nepalis (not 60 lakhs as claimed by GNLF) residing elsewhere in the country. If the communal situation in the country further deteriorates and affects the Napali population outside Darjeeling hills, would the hill tracts be able to provide them with shelter, food and employment? One might argue that the security of the Napali population in India (or for that matter of any other minority, particularly those who are spread over a large

ಎಸ್.ಎಸ್. ಕೊರೇಮಠ
ನಿವೃತ್ತ ಪ್ರಾಂಶುಪಾಲರು
ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ

part of the country) lies, not in creating Gorkhaland; but, in helping to create a secular and democratic India free from communal, chauvinist, local and ethnic feelings, where job mobility is fully secured. In West Bengal, where the state government is committed to secularism, and has consistently fought chauvinist campaign against non-Bengali workers, the minorities have even less to fear.

Whereas Gheising has repeatedly made the point that his campaign is not for realising economic demands but for "land", at the same time he has been generous with promises for jobs and promotions for everyone around. His supporters have gone even a step further in their whispering campaign. One such issue, raised by his supporters, involves comparison of Sikkim which with a population of three lakhs is receiving more than Rs. 90 crores of central grant, with Darjeeling which with a population of 11 lakhs (including the plains where the Nepalis are a minority) receive a central grant of about rupees nine crores. The inference to be drawn from such comparison is that, once a separate state of Gorkhaland is created, it would receive a similar generous subsidy on a per capita basis from the central government. Such comparison ignores the specific conditions under which Sikkim became a part of India, and the fact that there are obvious limits to such subsidy for tiny states.

GNLF is demanding a territory of 2,256 square miles, with about 14 lakhs of people, which would include the whole of Darjeeling, and much beyond. There are, however, conflicting versions regarding the territory being claimed. One claim stretches from some areas of North Bihar to some areas of Assam, including parts of Jalpaiguri and Cooch Bihar districts. A modest version covers the Dooars belt up to Santokh river and Alipurduar. In fact in many of these areas the Nepalis are a minority, e.g., in the plains of Darjeeling where they account for only 7·74 per cent of the population, and the Terai area where too they account for a similar share of the population; yet those areas have been included without concern for the interests of the dominant communities in those places.

Besides, the attitude of GNLF leadership towards other communities very often smacks of chauvinism, communalism, and an attitude of contempt. When asked whether he would consider the options of regional autonomy within the state or of a union territory in a recent interview with a journal, the reply given by Subhas Gheising was, "No no. These provisions are applicable only to Assam's backward tribal population. But we are not tribals. We will not be satisfied even with union territory status because such status is bestowed on people who are uncivilised, very backward, whose men go naked and whose women go bare-breasted. But we are advanced people. We are civilised. Look at me. I wear a three-piece suit and shoes." (Frontline, August 9, 1986). Considering that a significant minority in the hills of Darjeeling are tribals (Lepchas and Bhutias) as also those in the plains of Darjeeling and Jalpaiguri (Oroas, Mech, Modeshias) it may be asked whether such minorities would feel safe or be able to live with self-respect and dignity in a state where GNLF would wield power, if this is his attitude towards those communities.

The state government is seriously concerned about the depleting forest resources of the hills, which upsets the ecological balance and damages future prospects for agriculture, habitation and water supply in the hills. This is also affecting the environment in the plains by disrupting water supply and causing floods, apart from its long term effects

on weather prospects. Taking these into account, the state government, through the Hill Development Council, has given a high priority to schemes for soil conservation, afforestation and water-shed planning, as also to develop popular consciousness regarding the adverse consequences of tree felling.

At the same time, the state government is of the view that trees and various forest products, if properly husbanded, can constitute an important source of earning for the hill economy whose agricultural productivity is low and which is short of mineral resources. The main consideration of the state government is to maintain the 'stock' of trees while generating sufficient 'flows' through careful planning to augment the earnings of the local population, for many of whom forest products are an important source of livelihood. It is also necessary to create public opinion against unscrupulous timber merchants and contractors and the colluding forest officials, so that unlicensed felling is prevented, legal action is swiftly taken against the culprits, and the forest resources of the region are preserved. This is a constructive approach, aimed at boosting the local economy, while the programme of GNLF to forcibly prevent the flow of timber out of the hill region would be a self-defeating exercise.

Among other issues raised by GNLF, we have already dealt with the arguments about 'genocide' or 'plebiscite' for a permanent solution of the problems of the Gorkhas; and the issue of language would be dealt with below. We have also demonstrated that there is no evidence of neglect of the hill region by the state government, nor is there any historical basis to the claim that Darjeeling was once a part of Nepal.

The state government takes the view that the agitation based on such non-issues, half-truths, and blatant lies has already caused a great deal of damage to the local economy and its social life. The thriving tourist industry with immense prospects for future development is now in shambles. The trade in summer was poor, and the expected volume of tourist traffic during Puja is likely to be even less. As long as this atmosphere of violence, intimidation and uncertainty continues, Darjeeling is unlikely to draw the tourists. This decline in tourist trade is seriously affecting the livelihood of a large number of traders, hoteliers, transport-workers, and those otherwise connected with the supply of provisions, construction activities and so on related to the tourist industry. Over the past few years, the state government has given a great deal of effort to make Mirik a major source of tourist attraction, and a number of tourist lodges and youth hostels have been constructed with this in view—but this large investment in infrastructure would come to no benefit to the local population as long as this agitation continues to affect the life in the hills.

Similarly, the organised attacks on the workers of a large number of tea gardens, including the killings of a few and violent beating and torture of many, have led to a situation of lawlessness in those areas. There the armed unruly youth holding the banner of GNLF is intimidating the management. Some of the tea gardens have already declared lockout and several others might be forced to do so in future, thereby endangering the livelihood of a large number of workers in those estates. Tea industry being the backbone of the local economy, the paralysis of this industry would bring untold sufferings to 42,000 tea workers and a very large number of people

who are directly or indirectly dependent on tea, or whose income is derived from the demand for their goods and services from the workers in the tea industry. This is particularly alarming in view of the fact that the tea produced here is meant for exports. The export-market being as competitive as it is today with Sri Lanka, Kenya and Bangladesh presenting strong challenge to India in the world market, any fall in the share of Darjeeling tea in the world market due to the present chaos might imply an irretrievable loss for the local economy, as also for the country as a whole. Once this happens, the backbone of the economy would be broken, and, Gorkhaland or no Gorkhaland, the losers would be the people in the hills.

It is, therefore, important that people in the hills realise the danger facing their local economy, as the GNLF campaign is striking at the livelihood and well-being of the common masses. Once incomes from tea, timber and tourism are lost, even with a most generous subsidy from the central government, the local economy would go bankrupt. In addition, this campaign, by disrupting the excellent communal relations prevailing in the hills until very recently, has created uncertainty for a very large number of Nepalis, much larger than the population who live in Darjeeling, who live in other parts of the country.

According to the 1971 census, out of 14·20 lakhs Nepali-speaking population in India (including citizens of Nepal), 4,33,283 were living in the three hill sub-divisions of Darjeeling, that is 30·52 per cent, while the remaining 69·48 per cent lived in other parts of India. Assuming a linear annual growth rate of 3 per cent (including fresh migration), the total Nepali-speaking population in India now would be 21·23 lakhs, of whom 14·75 lakhs are residing outside the hill area of Darjeeling (Appendix F). One might ask how the creation of Gorkhaland is going to help those who are working and living all over the country?

VI. NATIONAL ISSUES

Given the implication of the GNLF agitation for national integration, communal harmony and security of the country, it is essential to unequivocally condemn this movement as anti-national. Any equivocation and dodging of the main issues at any level would actually encourage the leaders of Gorkhaland agitation to continue their campaign. The GNLF agitators seem to think that through distortion of facts and militant postures they can achieve their divisive goal. In fact in one of his recent interviews, Subhas Gheising is reported to have said "Government of India understands only the language of agitation. Any one who agitates with sufficient force secures his demands. Look at Assam, Mizoram" (Frontline—August 9, 1986).

The policy of appeasing the separatists is self-defeating and counter-productive. Without prompt political intervention and concrete action such movement can easily get out of hands. The serious nature of this agitation should not, therefore, be overlooked.

The state government does not view this agitation as merely a 'law and order' problem, but basically as a political one. While the law and order part of it can be handled by the state government itself, this agitation has raised a number of broader political issues which can only be clinched at the national level. The issues of state-hood, the questions raised about the Indo-Nepal Treaty and its implications for the Indian citizens of Nepali origin, the historical basis of the claims being made about the 'ceded territories' of Nepal or about the 'vivisection of Nepal' by the British, the financial support being given to the hill regions, the future of tea exports—these are issues which impinge on national politics.

Leaders of the GNLF agitation have been claiming that their demands were being made only to the government of India. The state government requested the government of India to make a categorical and unequivocal statement in regard to the agitation and on the points raised by the GNLF. In fact the Chief Minister met the Union Home Minister on 6th August, 1986 and had a detailed discussion with him on this issue. Specific questions were asked in Lok Sabha on 13th August, 1986, requesting for unequivocal statement on—(*a*) whether the Indo-Nepal Treaty in any way affects the citizenship rights of the Nepali-speaking Indians, and (*b*) whether the central government considers this agitation on Gorkhaland as 'anti-national' and 'secessionist' in character and scope. The reply given by P. Chidambaram, Minister of State, Ministry of Home Affairs to the first question was categorical that the Treaty does not adversely affect the Indian citizens who speak Nepali:

> "We have made it very clear that the Nepali-speaking Indian citizens are as much as the other Indian citizens are. The people of Nepali origin, who have got citizenship rights are citizens of India and they are entitled for all the rights and privileges of Indian citizens. As Prime Minister has just said, this Treaty in no way affects Indian citizens of Nepali origin. Articles 6 and 7 of the Treaty provide reciprocal rights to

Indians in Nepal and Nepalis in India. Nepalis who have come to India and who have remained here for a long number of years, but are not yet citizens would be greatly affected if the treaty is abrogated."

However, the reply to the second question was couched in general terms "we condemn every anti-national movement" without categorically labelling this particular agitation as 'secessionist' and 'anti-national'. In fact, the GNLF agitators have been widely publicising by way of posters and leaflets, the reported statement of Arjun Singh, Vice-President of the Congress(I) that the movement could not be described as 'anti-national' since they were seeking statehood within the country.

In contrast, R. L. Bhatia, General Secretary of Congress(I) in a reported statement has branded the movement as 'anti-national'. Similarly, the State Congress(I) joined with other political parties in a statement declaring this movement as 'anti-national' and 'secessionist' on the 18th August, 1986.

Ajit Panja, Minister of State, Government of India, is reported to have said that the state government is diverting funds meant for hill development. While this is not true, the statement itself tends to justify the GNLF allegation that the government of West Bengal is only concerned with the well-being of the people of the plains and have been depriving the hill people of the funds meant for them in the interests of people in the plains. Siddhartha Shankar Ray, Governor of Punjab, is reported to have made an unwarranted observation that the people in the hill areas had several legitimate grievances without specifying what those grievances were. While it is ironical that the GNLF leadership has claimed that its agitation had no economic content there are some self-proclaimed well-wishers of the hill population who are unnecessarily trying to add economic dimension to the movement. These contradictory positions taken by the central political leadership at various levels have contributed to the confusion from which the secessionists are deriving a great deal of comfort.

The central government would also have to seriously consider the issues relating to Nepali language and regional autonomy within West Bengal, which have been time and again raised by the government of West Bengal, the state assembly and the members of parliament from West Bengal. While these issues would be dealt with in detail below, here it would suffice to add, that had the national government been more responsive to those demands the Gorkhaland agitation would have lost its sting. However, the state government is appreciative of the support received from the central government in terms of armed personnel.

VII. THE STANDPOINT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF WEST BENGAL

While opposing the secession of Darjeeling hills or its statehood or even the status of union territory, the government of West Bengal has consistently recognised the cultural distinctiveness of the Nepali population in the hills, and has taken measures to ensure that the separate cultural and social development of the Nepali population is not hindered by their minority status in the state.

One of the issues raised relates to the language of the Nepali-speaking population. As early as 1961, the state assembly of West Bengal recognised Nepali as the second language in the Darjeeling hill area, and since then efforts have been made to introduce Nepali as much as possible in administrative correspondence, and to allow for Nepali translation of major government documents and circulars (Appendix C). There is need for further intensified effort in this direction in the years to come.

Another issue relating to language is the question of the recognition of Nepali in the eighth schedule of the Indian constitution. The state government of West Bengal fully supports such demand and there is no worthwhile reason why the central government should not concede such demand. In fact when Morarji Desai visited Darjeeling hills as the Prime Minister of India in 1978, and made the incredible statement that Napali is a 'foreign language' and hence cannot be considered for incorporation in the eighth schedule, the government of West Bengal protested against this statement and pointed out that even Sindhi is included in that schedule because a section of Indians speak that language. On a number of occasions resolutions have been passed by the state assembly in West Bengal, urging the central government to give recognition to Nepali language by incorporating it in the eighth schedule. In 1977, Biren Bose, MLA from Siliguri, moved the following resolution which was unanimously passed by the state assembly:

> "The Napali-speaking population of India had been for a long time demanding the constitutional recognition of their language.
>
> "In 1969 the United Front government of West Bengal recognised Nepali as official language, alongside Bengali, in three hill sub-divisions of Darjeeling in West Bengal—Darjeeling, Kurseong and Kalimpong. Furthermore, Nepali language has been accepted as a subject for teaching in under-graduate and post-graduate courses in the universities of Calcutta, North Bengal and Patna.
>
> "In this circumstance, this assmebly is recommending to the central government the constitutional recognition of Nepali language by its inclusion in the eighth schedule, so that the Nepali-speaking population can participate more fully in the national life of the country."

The same view was expressed by another motion, moved by Asoke Bose in 1981, which too was passed unanimously in the state assembly. This is, therefore, a demand which has been articulated by all sections of political opinion in West Bengal. Even the Left Front dominated state assembly of Tripura passed a resolution supporting such constitutional resolution of Nepali language. Yet the response of the national government has been negative without any valid reason.

A second issue concerns the question of regional autonomy. There is a misleading view, which is being actively canvassed by a section of the press and some political parties, that the Left Front and its government are recent converts to the idea, and that it aims at appeasing the regional sentiment in Darjeeling hill area. The fact is that the issue of regional autonomy within the state of West Bengal, has been under discussion for many years now, and the left wing parties have been consistently advocating this for several decades. Furthermore, in the past this demand received a large measure of support from a wide range of political parties of West Bengal, including Congress. It should not, therefore, come as a news to those knowledgeable that the state government is championing the cause of regional autonomy in Darjeeling hills.

As early as in 1957, when Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru visited Darjeeling, a memorandum demanding regional autonomy for Darjeeling hill area was submitted to him which was signed by the representatives of Congress, Communist Party and the All-India Gorkha League, the three major political parties in the region, as also 50 representatives of various communities including Bengalis, Lepchas, Bhutias and so on, all the MLAs and MPs in the hill area irrespective of their party affiliation, as also more than fifty MLAs from the plains. Earlier, in 1955, a similar representation was made before the States Reorganisation Commission when it visited Darjeeling. On 15th May, 1955, a resolution was passed by the Darjeeling District Committee of Indian National Congress which demanded a statutory District Council "to aid and advise the government on matters of administration." Similar memoranda were submitted to Mrs. Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India, during her visit to Darjeeling in 1966 and 1972. Thus, the idea of regional autonomy within the state of West Bengal, is not an afterthought, or a sop to the separatists, but has been practically the unanimous demand of all political parties including Congress in the hills, and of the Communist Party and All-India Gorkha League from the time of independence.

After the formation of the United Front government in 1967, a resolution was passed by the state assembly making this demand. On a more recent occasion, another resolution was passed in the state assembly on 23rd September, 1981. The resolution urged the central government to amend the Constitution in order to create a statutory autonomous authority within the structure of West Bengal and subject to the overall authority and control of the state government and legislature. It was felt by all the political parties represented in the state legislature that such a body would help to "make a balanced and correct assessment of the needs of the said region, give proper representation to the democratic aspirations of the people of the said region and mobilise extensively the human and natural resources for speedy and well co-ordinated execution of development projects and further strengthen the bonds of unity between the people speaking Nepali, Bengali and other languages."

In line with this unanimous resolution, a Constitution (Amendment) Bill was proposed by Ananda Pathak, Samar Mukherjee and Somenath Chatterjee, three MPs, as a private member's bill, on 9th July, 1983. In the statement of objects and reasons reference was made to the "significant and gallant contributions" made by the Nepali-speaking people, the need to draw them closer to the national mainstream by providing them opportunities for participation in administration and development activities, and to fight off the forces of disintegration which are demanding 'Gorkhaland'. However, this bill was rejected in parliament. Again, on 9th August, 1985, a similar bill was proposed in the name of Ananda Pathak, which too was turned down. All these to make it clear that the support given by the state government to regional autonomy in Derjeeling hills is by no means a sudden decision—it has a long history behind it, and the position of those political parties which are in the state government has always been consistent on this, while, at the state level, this proposal received unanimous support from all political parties including those belonging to Congress or Congress(I).

One of the criticisms against this proposal is that regional autonomy for the hills of Darjeeling would in practice amount to separation from the rest of West Bengal; and those making such demand would have no moral standing to oppose the status of union territory or state for the area. This criticism is not valid, since the District Autonomous Council suggested above would have worked under the jurisdiction of the state legislature, High Court and the state government. After the formation of the District Autonomous Council in Tripura (which covers the greater part of the state territory, unlike Darjeeling hill area which accounts for a small share of the territory of West Bengal) and its regular functioning in that state for the past three years—where it operates in tribal areas and is very much subject to the powers and authority of the state government—this is no longer a hypothetical exercise. Those who still believe that the fiat of the state government would not extend to the area covered by such an autonomous council and that such council is interchangeable with separate statehood, would only have to visit Tripura and verify for themselves whether such ADCs operate independently of the state government, or not.

There are those who argue that this proposal aims at appealing to the regional sentiment, and actually strengthens the moral position of the separatists. One journalist in a major newspaper went to the extent of claiming that 'Gorkhaland' is the 'illegitimate child' of such proposals in the past which roused regional feelings. Taken to its logical end, such argument would oppose demands for federalism on the ground that this amounts to advocating national disintegration, while many would argue that federalism actually strengthens national unity. If demand for regional autonomy indeed fostered separatism and secessionism then, it might be asked, why the Indian Constitution, in its article 244 and schedule VI provides for such constitutional arrangement? Could this be otherwise than the fact that the constitution-makers saw it as a way of strengthening national unity in specific situations? While it is true that the constitutional provision presently applies only to tribal areas, this is precisely why an amendment of the article 244 is being sought, in some specific situations, to make it applicable to non-tribal areas with such culturally distinct minorities living in compact areas. The logic behind the demand for regional autonomy should not be confused with the demand for statehood. While the former is intended to forge national unity by recognising the cultural and ethnic diversity of the population where any attempt to steamroll an artificial all-embracing unity would be counter-productive, the latter, in

this particular case, is an argument for strengthening the forces of national disunity. Again, the experience with the Autonomous District Council in Tripura conclusively demonstrates how the forces of separatism can be politically defeated—as confirmed by the results of the elections to ADC, state assembly and parliament—by the creation of such autonomous district councils and how it has helped to isolate TNV and its patron Tripura Upajati Juba Samity from the tribal masses. The close integration of the tribals with the state administration in Tripura, despite the riot provoked by the communal and imperialist forces some years back, bears testimony to the claim that the formation of such regional autonomous bodies, dealing with local land, customs and several other issues, acts as a counterweight to separatist propaganda. We will argue that, had this long-standing demand of the Nepali-speaking population been met by the central government, along with the constitutional recognition of their language, the separatist propaganda could be more effectively countered.

It is also being asked why the Left Front government of West Bengal is resisting the demand for a separate state for the Nepalis when the parties constituting the Left Front supported the linguistic re-organisation of Indian states in the mid-fifties? Our opposition is based on the fact that there are obvious limits to the number of states which can be created out of the Indian territory. The demand for linguistic re-organisation voiced in the mid-fifties was related to the major linguistic groups. To apply this principle to all the linguistic groups would lead to the creation of hundreds (if not thousands) of Indian states, each with a tiny population of a few lakhs, and even then containing minorities which in their turn would demand further division of such micro-states. There is an obvious flaw in the argument that if Sikkim with a population of three lakhs can attain statehood, every linguistic group with a population exceeding three lakhs should be given a separate state. Taken to its logical conclusion, and considering that the population of India presently exceeds 75 crores, there would be demand for 2,500 such states. Already, the attainment of the statehood by Mizoram, and the campaign on Gorkhaland has led to further demands, such as those for Kamtapuri state in North Bengal, Jharkhand state in the border area between West Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh, and Uttarkhand comprising the eight hill districts of Uttar Pradesh. Once this process of disintegration is under way, there would be no end to the splintering of the country—each region, locality, and cluster of villages would claim for itself a separate national identity. At the end of it all there would be no India, and the country would be at the mercy of the imperialists who are anxious to balkanise and thereby weaken this vast country of ours. If the demand for Gorkhaland materialise, is there any guarantee that in due course the minorities in the hills such as the Lepchas and Bhutias would not in their own turn demand their own homeland?

Solution to the problem of minorities, therefore, does not lie in creating yet another state, but in ensuring within the framework of given states safeguards for the language and culture of those minorities and arrangements for making them participants in administration on issues which solely concern them and not others in the state. The idea of Autonomous District Council is precisely to meet this objective in a specific situation.

The government of West Bengal has so far taken a keen interest in preserving and promoting the language and culture of the Nepali community. Apart from actively implementing the Act of 1961, which makes Nepali a second language alongside Bengali in the

three hill sub-divisions, the Left Front government has set up a Nepali Translation Cell and a Nepali Press in Darjeeling, and has established Nepali Academy for promoting the language and culture of the Nepali people. The construction of a meeting hall in the name of the great Nepali poet Bhanubhakt Acharya, and the giving of literary awards in his name is another such instance of the kind of support being given by the government of West Bengal. The fact that GNLF called for the boycott of the ceremony on July 13, where four distinguished writers and artistes were given award in the name of Bhanubhakt, betrays its communal orientation, while the fact that the ceremony took place in front of a packed audience and all but one of the award winners turned up despite intimidation, shows that those associated with Nepali culture are appreciative of the role played by the state government in this field. The position of GNLF, that the state government had no right to give the award in the name of Bhanubhakt because he is a Nepali, and that an award in the name of Rabindranath would have been more appropriate coming as it did from the government of West Bengal, is downright racist, whereas the decision of the latter to show respect to this towering literary personality of Nepali origin demonstrates that in its view West Bengal is not only for the Bengalis but for the other communities living here too. While the policy of GNLF is to keep the Nepali-speaking population away from the rest of the Indian citizenry, the objective of the government of West Bengal is to make them an integral part of the national mainstream while at the same time helping them to maintain their separate cultural identity.

The state government takes the view that West Bengal is as much a homeland for the Nepali-speaking population living here as it is for the other communities. We see our state as a mosaic of various cultures and ways of life, where each community has an important role to play, by enriching and diversifying the overall culture of the state and by making the social life more varied and enjoyable. Nepalis, with their distinct language, look, customs and habits are an integral part of the cultural heritage and landscape of this state of ours.

Tea gardens, which form the backbone of the hill economy in the hills, is also a platform where communities from various parts of the country come together. The lush green tea estates are a microcosm of the Indian entity where the Nepalis, tribals from Bihar, Bengalis, Lepchas, Bhutias, Mech and other hill and non-hill tribes work side by side, and come to know each other, and strengthen their bond as working people irrespective of their linguistic, ethnic, religious and other differences. The struggles fought by the trade unions in the tea gardens over many decades have brought about a working class consciousness and solidarity which transcends other loyalties and bonds. What the GNLF is after is to undermine this spirit of national integration and unity of the working people which pervades the life in the gardens.

As we have repeatedly stated, the state government does not view the issue as essentially one of law and order. The issues raised are political in nature, and should be treated at that level. What is going on in the hills of Darjeeling is an intense struggle for the mind of the ordinary folk. Whereas the separatists are introducing non-issues and trading in lies and half-truths to play on the fear and anxiety of the minorities and generate communal feelings amongst them, there are others in the hills, no less Nepali than the protagonists of Gorkhaland and with a long record of struggles, sufferings and imprisonment for the just

causes of the peasants, workers and employees of the area, who are championing the cause of national unity and valiantly defending communal amity. While, admittedly, a significant section of the Nepali-speaking population has been swayed by the distorted separatist propaganda, and has become victim of the passions roused by GNLF, the state government is confident that they too would desert the side of the separatists once they are able to see through the web of malice and lies. It is, therefore, important that the facts are brought to the knowledge of the common folk so that he cannot be misled. Having amicably lived with the other communities for such a long time and all over the country, it is only a matter of time before the forces of national unity among the Nepalis would inflict defeat on their adversaries. The ordinary Nepali-speaking peasant and worker or a middle class employee has no quarrel with the Bengalis, tribals from Bihar and other Indian communities or with the government of West Bengal. Like other ordinary citizens all over the country, he too is keen to maintain communal harmony and to live in peace. Therefore, the objective of the state government is to isolate the separatists from this ordinary peace-loving Nepali-speaking population.

Yet, the fact remains that despite this attitude of the state government, on three occasions over the past few months, the police resorted to firing, which led to 19 deaths. In each case, according to the reports received so far, the police party was attacked by determined armed squads, who ferociously assaulted with *kukri* and endangered the safety of the police personnel, pushing them into an impossible situation and thereby leaving them with no option but to fire in self-defence. An executive enquiry on the police firing in Kurseong has been held. The report of enquiry has held the firing to be justified. An enquiry in regard to the police firing in Kalimpong is under process. There can be no doubt that what has happened is very unfortunate. The government of West Bengal has nothing but sympathy for the bereaved, and hopes that occasions for firing would never arise again. At the same time, such violent agitations and attacks on policemen engineered by the GNLF have to be dealt with effectively and firmly. Violence has become the creed of this agitation, and already several opponents of the movements have been hacked or knifed to death. With blood stained *kukri* as its symbol, this agitation has already been responsible for a great deal of bloodshed and loss of life in the area.

It, however, goes to the credit of the political parties operating in West Bengal that, in a meeting convened by the Chief Minister on 18.8.86, they unanimously agreed to a resolution, which unequivocally condemned the Gorkhaland agitation as 'anti-national' and 'secessionist' (Appendix D). The signatories included the leaders of the following parties: CPI(M), Congress(I), Forward Block, RSP, CPI, Janata, BJP, Lok Dal, West Bengal Socialist Party, SUC, DSP, Biplabi Bangla Congress, Congress(S), RCPI. This resolution would greatly boost the morale of those who are fighting against the separatist and secessionist forces in the hills, and are upholding the banner of national unity and communal harmony, braving their lives.

Lastly, it is a question to ponder over by every one concerned over this agitation for Gorkhaland, how, within the short span of only a few months, the organisation of GNLF could grow so rapidly ? Who these people are who are leading the armed squads in attacks against the police and their adversaries ? Where were they before ? One observes a great

deal of money pouring in—from where no one knows. A large army of 'volunteers' is being retained on a daily wage—who is financing ? These questions are being raised because only a few months ago, more precisely until April, 1986, very few people in the hills knew about Subhas Gheising or his organisation, GNLF. Could this be that the agitation for 'Gorkhaland' is just the tip of the iceberg ? Could this be that this separatist movement is part of a grand design to dismember and severely weaken India, and to open it for ruthless economic exploitation by foreign interests ? And why this absurd obsession with those innocuous provisions in the Indo-Nepal Treaty? Does it indicate that there is more to it than meets the eyes? Following the sequence of events in Darjeeling over the past few months, can one not link it with the agitations for Khalistan and independent Assam, Tribal Tripura, and Mizoram, Jharkhand, Kamtapuri, Uttarkhand and similar other movements ? Can one not discern the 'invisible hand' whose objective it is to weaken the Indian army and destabilise the Indian sub-continent ?

At the state level, there can be no doubt that this movement aims at disrupting and weakening the strong trade union base in the tea gardens, destabilising the Left Front government of West Bengal, and, at the least, tarnishing its excellent record in terms of communal harmony, as also inspiring similar separatist movements elsewhere. It is, therefore, the sacred duty of those committed to national unity and communal harmony, and opposed to imperialist conspiracies to dismember India, to stand up and fight against this anti-national secessionist movement.

APPENDIX A

MEMORANDUM

To
His Majesty the King Birendra Bir Bikram Shadev,
Narayan Hiti King Palace, Kathmundu Nepal.

Benign Sir,

Even thirty-six years after Bharat Independence the settled ethnic race of the Gorkhas of more than six millions are living as degraded human beings in every parts of the country of India and the parts of their own ceded land of Sugaulee Treaty by surrendering their national spirit, national identity, historical pride and their homeland and destiny, and further they became the naked victims of foreign national issue, deportation issue and unnecessary police torture, arrests, raids, killings and continuous undesirable inhuman acts of deligrate imposition of systematic domination of other Indian races. And under such cruel pressures of racial segregated atmosphere and directly denial of justice of liberty, equality, fraternity and opportunity—the Gorkha National Liberation Front had to be formed to meet the above cruel challange of a series of apartheid and genocide crimes done by the state and central Govts. of India since Bharat Independence and further to ventilate the same view points of the said untold tragedies of the Gorkhas to the International forum. This organisation was compelled to appeal to the real historical court of your Majesty in the context of dire consequences of the past treaties and agreements of the then British Govt. and Nepal that the aboriginally inhabiting Gorkhas became in serious false position when their historic lands and territories were mercilessly ceded to the land of British Empire by the Treaty of Sugaulee on 2nd Dec. 1815 and thereafter a large number of the frustrated Gorkha sponteneously left their humiliated country with their wounded hearts and mental agony due to serious repercussions of the said damaging Treaty of Sugaulee and the cruel atmosphere of internal political turmoils of the country of Nepal and further they joined in the British troops as soldiers and as labourers in the coal fields, oil fields and tea gardens without any official sanctions of the Nepal Government and this type of mass exodus continued from the year of 1816 to 1884 from the land of vivisected country of Nepal to the various parts of Indian soil and the parts of their own ceded land of Sugaulee Treaty and the parts of Rajabhatkhuwa Treaty on 11th November, 1965 and thereafter from the year of 1885 the Gorkhas were officially allowed to join in the British troops by the written agreement of the then British Govt. and Nepal and this the real history of 10th Gorkha

Battalion was started from the year 1890 in the soil of foreign country and thereafter the aforesaid Gorkhas of three catagories and thoroughly censused and the year of 1891 and made them Nepal subjects or national under the direct suzerainty of His Majesty the King of Nepal by the concluded reciprocal treaty of 21st December, 1923 of the then British Govt. and Nepal and further just after the end of World War-II, one of the main responsible signatory of the past treaties and agreements Britisher themselves gone back to their own country of England having decided only the fate and fortune of the Hindus and Muslims of Indian origin by creating two separate independent countries of Bharat and Pakistan and the said Gorkhas and their ceded land and territories were left at the cross roads of cyclic stage of self destruction from the date of 15th August '47 without revoking and suspending the past treaties and agreements of the then British Govt. and Nepal or without deciding or confirming the future status of the said ethnic Gorkhas and their ceded land by the legal act of Plebiscite of the act of handing over either to the Govt. of Nepal or India; and this type of unjustifiable act of the then quitting British Government utterly disregarded the general moral obligations of the said international treaties and agreements further created bitter feelings of terrible confusion doubts controversies in the minds of the whole settled ethnic race of the Gorkhas in present Independent country of India—who are the most ignorant of the true facts of the past treaties and agreements of the then British Government and Nepal and under such complexities and deep rooted illusion they have unknowingly considered themselves as the true citizens or inhabitants of Independent Union of India and India as their motherland or country since Independence just after three years of Bharat Independence the Indo-Nepal Treaty of 21st July, 1950 and British-Nepal Treaty of 30th October, 1950 also did virtually nothing to repair the damaged fate of the said Gorkhas and vis-a-vis their ceded land and territories and revoked exactly the same damaging terms and conditions of the said past treaties and agreements of the then British Government and Nepal; and such as act of inhuman of these two merciless treaties has directly violated the very principle of right of self determination proclaimed by the President Woodrew Wilson, in his 14-points programme on 8th January, 1919 on the face of the International Peace Treaty and at the same time violated the very principle and essence of Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 10th December, 1948; and thus permanently sealed the fate of the whole settled Gorkhas in present Independent India by sustaining the same old dehumanizing cruel method of out dated colonialism, feadism, barbarism and fraudism that the Gorkhas were perpetually subjected to fight the wars of other countries by losing everything of their own of National Identity, Political safeguard and their historical homeland and destiny.

As such seriously keeping in view of above mentioned unpardonable historical crimes against huminity or still unresolved question of very political existence of future status of the said Gorkhas in Indian Union the above three responsible signatories countries of Nepal, Bharat and British have been urged to abrogate the said existing Indo-Nepal and Indo-British Treaties of 1950 and further adopt a fresh a new treaties for a permanent political settlement of the said victimised Gorkhas as per mentioned in the provisions of the charter of United Nations and also confirm accordingly the future status of their ceded land and territories and for this serious burning ethnic issue of the said Gorkhas the Gorkha National Liberation Front submits this memorandum to the true and dynamic leadership of your

Majesty to take up a bold step for historical decision and your Majesty's selomonic judgement.

Now the verdict lies with your
Majesty.
For and on behalf of the
Gorkha National Liberation Front

Subhash Ghissing
23.12.83
President *G.N.L.F.*
Gorkhaland, Bharat

Copy to the Presidents:

1. President of America.
2. President of U.S.S.R.
3. President of France.
4. President of India.
5. President of Pakistan.
6. President of Bangladesh.
7. President of Shree Lanka.

Copy to the Prime Ministers:

1. Prime Minister of India.
2. Prime Minister of China.
3. Prime Minister of Great Britain.
4. Prime Minister of Nepal.

Copy to His/her Majesty to the King/Queen/Prince:

1. His Majesty the King of Nepal.
2. His Majesty the King of Bhutan.
3. Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain.
4. His Majesty the Prince of Nepal (Gyanendra).
5. U.N. Secretary General, U.N.O. (Neu York), America.

And others:

1. Ex-Prime Minister Suryabahadur Thapa.
2. Ex-Prime Minister Dr. Tulshi Giri.
3. Ex-Prime Minister Kirtinidhi Bista.
4. Supreme Court Advocate Sambhu Prasad Gawali.
5. Supreme Court Advocate Krishna Prasad Panth.
6. Supreme Court Advocate Krishan Prasad Bhandari.
7. Harkabahadur Gurung Ex-Minister.
8. Intellectual and Writers and Press Reporters.

APPENDIX B

THE SPEECH OF SUBHAS GHEISING, DATED 2.6.1985

In today's general meeting at Kurseong, the previous speakers highlighted the need of a separate State "Gorkhaland" and analysed the Indo-Nepal agreement of the year 1950. As a fact, despite our repeated reminder, the India Government has been giving false consolation to us. We have every right to claim for a separate State "Gorkhaland" we being the citizen of India. To our demand for a separate State "Gorkhaland" neither India nor Nepal Government is giving any attention. My main question is what was the necessity of sending the matter of Gorkhaland to the U.N.O. If the late P.M. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had considered the Nepali or Gorkhas of India, there was no need of sending the matter of Gorkhaland to U.N.O. He (Pdt. Nehru) did much good for the sake of Biharis, Bengalis, Punjabis and Assamese, but he did nothing for the sake of Nepalis or for the inclusion of Nepali language in 8th Schedule. His daughter Smt. Indira Gandhi continued giving false consolation towards the cause of Nepalese in India. Lastly she was gunned down by the Sikhs. Lalbahadur Sastri and Charan Singh also did nothing good for the Nepalese in India. On the otherhand Morarji Desai pointed us out as foreigners. Almost all the late P.Ms did nothing good for Nepalese. All the late P.Ms were only the P.Ms of Bengali, Bihari, Punjabi and all. But why they could not be our P.M.? Why they did not give justice for we Nepalese? In spite of our repeated memorandum and reminders, we the Nepalese could not get justice in the Indian Union. Only the Marwaris, Biharis, Punjabis, Bengalis got the justice in India. The Indian Government is not telling us that we (Nepalese) are citizens of Nepal and the India Government is also not telling us (Nepalese) that due to the 1950 Indo-Nepal Treaty, we (Nepalese) are not getting our demands. So, we don't hope much that the present P.M. Rajiv Gandhi also will do something for the sake of Gorkhas or Nepalese of India.

Since Independence 38 years passed under false consolation of Indian Government. We don't want to get separated from India, we want to remain within Indian Union being its loyal citizen. Simply we have demanded a separate identity or separate State within Indian Union. If the centre can give separate State Bengal for Bengalis, Rajasthan for Marwaris, Assam for Assamese, why we the Nepali, Gorkha cann't get separate State "Gorkhaland" within Indian Union ? Why the centre could not give a separate State for 60 lakhs of Nepalese ? If the citizen of any country could not get bonafide justification, how the democracy can remain alive ? The India Govt. talks about secularism, national integration but in practice it is nil. We 60 lakh Nepalese want justice from Delhi. The centre should not continue the reign of muscle power. Since Independence the Central Govt. is continuously neglecting the demands of 60 lakh Nepalese in India. To-day I like to disclose many things that the Centre has provided proper security and guarantee for the soil and future of Bengalis in Bengal but we don't have any security, future prospects

for our generations to come. Recently I had gone to Kathamandu alongwith the ex-army men Shri B. B. Gurung and Nawin Tamang and met the P.M. of Nepal Shri Lokendra Bahadur Chand. I asked him that according to Indo-Nepal Treaty of 1950 and Sugouli agreement, why we the Nepalese (residing in India) had been mentioned or considered as "Reciprocal". This word "Reciprocal" had become a blemish for we (Nepalese in India). This word "Reciprocal" indicates that we (Nepalese) have come to India after 1950 treaty as immigrants. According to this treaty (1950), we, the Nepalese (in India) can stay in India freely, we can earn our livelihood in India, we can visit Nepal and come back to India freely without restriction and if we did not like to stay in India, we can go back to Nepal.

Accordingly, we are not bonafide citizens of India. Life and future is not secured here for us in India. So this Sugouli Sandhi (agreement) and Indo-Nepal agreement of 1950 have caused a great hamper for our Nepalese in India due to the use of the word "Reciprocal". We have simply become hired tenants in the country of Gandhi, Nehru, Sastri, Morarji Desai, Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi. We have been given only domicile status. In India we are only domiciled citizens (temporary settlers). As a domicile citizen we only get civil right as per international law. According to international law "Foreigners are entitled to enjoy all the civil rights enjoyed by the national native and they shall be allowed all the benefit of rights in all acts in essential acts as well in the form of procedure and the legal remedial incidents there-to absolutely in like manner as native. A nation has not recognised in favour of foreigner any order of obligation or responsibility done to those who are in favour of the natives or are established in like cases by the constitution and the law. National as foreigners are under the same protection of law and the national authority, and the foreigners may not claim other rights as more extensive than those of the nationals."

So, accordingly we can not claim more rights as others like Biharis, Punjabis, Bengalis and all. Language should be permanent but we ourselves (Nepalese) have not become permanent (in India). How the language (Nepali) can get permanency ? Also it is written in International law on domicile that while the individual voluntarily resides in the country, or it is not a question of nationality, or patriotic sentiment. There are two types of domiciled—voluntary domicile and commercial domicile. There is the question of nationality. We are Indian national or Nepal national. We have been trapped in this (India) country. I like to repeat the past history. India cannot decide the fate of all Gorkhas. The question is why the Indian Govt. cannot decide the fate of 60 lakhs of Nepalese (in India). If the Indian Govt. can decide the fate of 60 lakhs of Gorkhas (in India), let it (Indian Govt.) create Gorkhaland. But the Indian Govt. cannot create "Gorkhaland". The Indian Govt. cannot include Nepali language in 8th Schedule of Indian Constitution. We have to declare, we have to tell the Indian Govt. that we are not here in India in accordance with the 1950 Indo-Nepal agreement, but we have been here in this land since 12th century back.

In the 12th century at Gidhey Pahar (near Kurseong), a war had broken out between the then King Tarbu Lepcha, Luang Sing and Magadh Raja where the King Tarbu Lepcha was killed. That time Magadh Raja had come to invade this land. In the same war, Bajahang Kirat Raja, Limbu Raja had come here as General. In this war Magadh Raja, Bajahang were killed. After this war, our border was demarcated at Mahanadi (near Siliguri).

Since 1780 Siliguri, Dhupguri, Mainaguri, Phuaguri, Nagari—all these Guri (Castles) used to belong to Gorkhas. During these wars the blooded *Khukuri* (Bhujali) was washed at Teesta river. After that this land came under the Gorkhas of Nepal. In the Nepal-British war of 1814, this land was divided or cut off. Later on this cut off land went into the hand of East-India Company. This land was taken over by East-India Company. The border dispute came in the picture. On 21st June, 1840, about 6 thousand Nepalese soldiers started sepoy mutiny. Then those 6,000 Nepalese soldiers asked the then King of Nepal give them order to attack against the East-India Company because in the name of friendship our land had been taken away by the East-India Company, if our land are not given back to us (Nepal), we should kick out all the Britishers residing in Nepal, Sikkim, Kuoun, Garwal also should be given back.

After the revolt of 1846 in Nepal, Shri Jang Bahadur Rana become the P.M. of Nepal, he was a forcious P.M. in Nepal. He dealt severely with Britishers in Nepal. Our Gorkhas in British army started recruiting in April 24th, 1815 after Sugouli Sandhi in Nasir Battalion and Kumoun Regiment etc. Then the P.M. Jangabahadur Rana totally stopped Gorkha recruitment under British Govt. in India. Any soldier in military uniform was restricted to come back to Nepal from India. They were allowed to come to Nepal only in Nepali national areas. But at the time of sepoy mutiny (in India) of 1857, at the request of Britishers Jangabahadur Rana supported the Britishers with 12,000 Gorkha soldiers and reached Lucknow. That time Lord Canning had residential houses in Nepal and he praised the Gorkha soldiers and requested to recruit them in British Gorkha Regiment, because they (Gorkha) are loyal, brave and cheaply available. The Gorkha soldiers fought bravely in the war of Nalapani. So in the sepoy mutiny of 1857, Jangabahadur Rana was asked by Britishers for help. In the success of sepoy mutiny (1857), the Gorkhas were also awarded with mutiny medal, Rs. 2,30,615/- was distributed among the Gorkha soldiers by the Britishers. Jangabahadur Rana was also awarded many gifts, even though Jangabahadur Rana was not happy with Britishers.

Now the Kumoun Regiment has been converted into 3 G.R., Nasis Battalion into 1st G.R., other 4th and 5th G.R. also created. The force of Prince of Wales was created in 1857. On 25.2.1825 Jangabahadur Rana expired. During the time of P.M. Bir Samser Jangabahadur Rana the Gorkha Regiment recruitment started openly. That time the soldiers were poorly paid. In 1890, the 5th G.R. was converted into 10th Gorkha Rifles, they the soldiers used to get only Rs. 5/- per month. In 1914 the Gorkhas fought the first World War. Then Chandra Samser Jangabahadur Rana became the P.M. of Nepal. Chandra Samser Jangabahadur Rana was the first Nepali to pass the Matriculation from Calcutta University. He was well versed in English language, he was very strict with the Britishers. At that time an agreement was made in 1923 to give Rs. 10 lakhs as royalty per year to Nepal Govt. in case of Gorkha recruitment by the Britishers. In 1942 the second World War broke out and ended in 1945. In 1944 the royalty of Nepal increased up to Rs. 20 lakhs, when India was about to get independence. Then the British Commissioner was about to leave India giving Pakistan to Muslims, Hindusthan to Gandhi, trust territory to Nagas and Darjeeling to Gorkhas (Nepali), but on the day of 19.1.46, the All India Gorkha League leaders committed a great blunder and a mistake opposing the grant of separate province of Darjeeling. The then British Commissioner had thought that the Gorkhas were

innocents, they do not know politics, since 1814 the Gorkhas were fighting in support of our cause, so we (Britishers) have to do something for the sake of Gorkhas, we have to give this province (Darjeeling) to the Gorkhas.

But the then leaders of All India Gorkha League made a great mistake denying the British proposal. So now we (Gorkha) have become the slaves of Bengali in Bengal. We have no enmity with Bengali, Marwari, Punjabi and Beharis, but we have the grudge only with the Gorkha (Nepali) who has already committed a mistake on 19.1.46. Now the Gorkha League sells its votes sometime to Congress and sometimes to CPI(M). To day we have to blame the Gorkha League itself.

This land taken from Nepal was given by Britishers to Nepal Govt. as buffer province. In this connection from Darjeeling Shri Dambarsing Gurung, Ranbir Subba, Sivokumar Rai had gone to Nepal to discuss with Nepal Govt. That time in Nepal Birendra Samser Mohan Samser, Chandra Samser and other had told that the land of Darjeeling should go back to Nepal but Balkishen Sam (dramatist) opposed and said that the land once taken by Britishers should not be mixed with Nepal. So we should not take it back. If we take back they (Nepalese of Darjeeling) use Gandhi-Congress Cap, they will hoist the tri-coloured flag in Nepal also. In fact Balkishen Sam (dramatist) was right, because now at present the people shout Gorkhaland Murdabad, Jyoti Basu Zindabad. The Gorkhas (Nepalese) are selling their blood, caste, their flags, they do not have the knowledge about their own position.

In 1950, the Indo-Nepal Troops agreement took place. According to this agreement, after getting recruitment in Gorkha troops (either from Nepal or India), the annual royalty goes to Nepal Govt. and as such the Gorkhas from India become the subject of Nepal Govt. In 1947 we could not get our province (Darjeeling) and Nepal Govt. also did not take this land (Darjeeling), this land remained neglected. The Britishers left India in 1947 but without plebiscite. So we should not think that the Indo-Nepal agreement of 1950 does not touch the Gorkhas of India. Either India or Nepal Govt. should give reply that how we become the hired tenants. Accordingly the Gorkha soldiers (either from India or Nepal) in British army belongs to Nepal Govt. as per the agreement and all the Gorkha troops (in India) are the subject of Nepal Govt. For example, Shri Sriman Narayan has written in a book that Indo-Nepal agreement no. 7 has become controversial. Sriman Narayan was the Secretary of the National Congress, a senior member of the Planning Commission as well as the member of Parliament. He is at present the Governor of Gujarat. He has also written that "There are some articles which have led to considerable misunderstanding and friction. It would be wiser to thrash out various issues in a frank and realistic manner so that there may be no confusion. Indo-Nepal treaty no. 7 is controversial, but the leaders of Gorkhaland, Congress and Nepali Bhasa Samity are misleading the common people of Darjeeling. Actually the former P.M. Shri Morarji Desai had understood about the controversial Indo-Nepal treaty no. 7 and so he had told that you people (Nepalese) were foreigners, your language was foreign. Morarji had said the truth, but the other P.Ms of India are telling lie. So we should be thankful to Morarji Desai who has opened our eyes.

After 1947 we became the domiciled citizens but what about this land (Darjeeling). How this land (Darjeeling) went to Bengal, and Bharat ? How the Bengali tells "Amar

Bengal, Amar Darjeeling" ? The proper settlement of Darjeeling and Teesta has not come so far, not the settlement of our fate. It is our only illegal occupation in Darjeeling. So that the Indian Govt. cannot give Gorkhaland and cannot include Nepali language in 8th Schedule of Indian Constitution, because we are the hired tenants of Nepal Govt. In this context we had placed a memorandum to the King of Nepal on 23.12.83 but the King of Nepal kept silent. He (King) did not utter any single word for we people. The then TIN (3) KO Sarkar of Nepal constructed "DHIRDHAN" in Darjeeling for Nepalese. Dhirdhan of Darjeeling is the duplication of "Pasupati Nath Mandir" (Nepal). Rs. 10 lakhs was given by the ex-Gorkha armymen, Nepal Tin (3) KO Sarkar had given huge money (in lakhs) to the Nepalis of Darjeeling during the landslide of 1950. The Govt. of Nepal was dear to us at that time. Then with a view to kick out the Rana dynasty from Nepal, the Nepal Govt. went into the hand of Panch (5) KO Sarkar, Nepal. Sri Panch (5) KO Sarkar fell in difficulties for expelling the Ranas out of Nepal. Then Panch (5) KO Sarkar sought the help of ex-armymen of Darjeeling to save the Kingdom of Nepal. Amongst the then ex-armymen we can take the name of Major Shri J. B. Limbu. Now the Rana-administration is rooted out of Nepal. Panch (5) KO Sarkar was saved, but to-day the Nepal Panch (5) KO Sarkar has done nothing for us. Nepal Govt. has not spelt any single word for us 2,50,000 Nepalese were expelled from Assam but Nepal Govt. did not raise any voice. The Gorkha Magazines of Nepal and Rising Nepal (periodical) did not publish anything about all these happenings. It was not published in any magazines of Panch (5) KO Sarkar of Nepal.

Now we Gorkhas of Darjeeling are facing difficulties for the sake of our cause, our Nepali brothers were beaten up at Sukiapokhari, Mirik, Darjeeling and jailed by Indian Govt., but the Nepal Govt. has not voiced anything in favour of us. To day there is nobody for we Gorkhas of Darjeeling neither Indian Govt. nor Nepal Govt. We Gorkhas in India, have been orphaned Nepal and Indian Govt. voiced in favour of Tamils but not for us. We have been affected by every treaties made by the Nepal Govt. Since February 25, 1975 Nepal Govt. is demanding to be declared it as Zone of peace-leand, which had been recognised by 60 other countries so far. It is an open question that the effect falls upon the 60 lakhs of Nepalese residing in India after the full declaration of Nepal as a Zone of peace. After the full declaration of Nepal as a Zone of peace, the Indo-Nepal treaty stands rejected and nullified. The Indo-Nepal Gorkha troops agreement also will be rejected, domiciled status of 1950 and reciprocal agreement will be rejected, also the Nepal-Great Britain treaty will be rejected. After the rejection of All Indo-Nepal treaties we the 60 lakh Nepalese (in India), will be nowhere. Later on, perhaps 75 lakh Biharis, Hindusthanis may be expelled from Nepal, also we 60 lakh Nepalese, may be expelled from India. The Sugauli treaty in between Nepal Britain will be rejected. To-day due to all these Indo-Nepal treaties, India Govt. has made us (Nepalese) crucified like Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ was awakened after 3 days of crucifixion, so we the Gorkhas also should be awakened. Nepal Govt. has not thought anything for the Nepalese in India, simply the Nepal Govt. has said to India Govt. that let them (Nepalese) earn their livelihood in India. Just to decide the fate of we the 60 lakh Nepalese, we have to create "Gorkhaland" in this land itself for our safety and security. We want the Teesta settlement in which river Teesta the blooded *Khukuri* was washed after the victory in this land. We don't want to remain in Bengal only but we want to remain within Indian Union creating our own land, "Gorkhaland". The central Govt. of India has not got the clear picture about Gorkhaland. The question will arise that

after the rejection of all treaties (between Britain-India-Nepal) if Nepal claimed this land (Darjeeling), what will be the consequences. What will be the result of the matter being raised in U.N.O. after the rejection of all treaties. So on the creation of Gorkhaland we will not be called as foreigners. Life and future will remain secured for every citizens of different linguistic society in Darjeeling. Gorkhaland is necessary for the local Bangalis, Biharis and Marwaris. Gorkhaland is our ethnic demand, but on the demand of Gorkhaland the Gorkhas had opposed. C.P.I.(M) has opposed. Indian Govt. has opposed. So they are the anti-national, not Gorkhaland. Congress, CPI(M) and Jyoti Basu want to make it (Gorkhaland) Teesta Anchal. We have been habituated to live in democratic country, we want to remain within Indian Union, we do not want to go back to Nepal, but the P.M. of India is trying to create Teesta Anchal in place of Gorkhaland. Gorkhaland is dear and suitable for we Gorkhas, Bengalis, Marwaris, Biharis and all. We the supporters of Gorkhaland are not now worried as because we have already submitted our matter in U.N.O The game is between Nepal and India. God knows who will be the winner.

The paper correspondences and memoranda which we have already submitted to the U.N.O. will be birth certificates for Nepali D.I.B., S.I.B. personnel and 60 lakh Nepalese (in India) and future generation to come. In the long run the papers placed in U.N.O. will save a lot at the time of difficulties. In the papers sent to U.N.O., we have reported about genocide crime (against the Indian Gorkhas) committed by Indian Govt. The Indian Govt. cannot oppress any linguistic society through any administration. So the time to avail Gorkhaland is not far away. We would not get merged in Sikkim, we would not accept Teesta Anchal but we want only Gorkhaland. To-day everywhere in the world many tiny countries are being created "MICRO-STATE". Which state's population is 57 thousand, 70 thousand only, the U.N.O. is recognising these countries as a separate sovereign countries, like China, Sicily, Congo etc. These countries' population is only 70 thousand. For the U.N.O. membership, there is need of only 55,000 dollar to be paid yearly. We do not accept Teesta Anchal. So, if the Gorkhaland could not be created, there is possibility of something happening in near future. We request all the Gorkha brothers and people of other linguistic communities that please do not oppose "Gorkhaland". In the past all the people of Darjeeling have opposed the Gorkhaland call of vote-boycott, but the Gorkhaland call of vote-boycott should not be opposed. Due to the opposition of Gorkhaland call vote-boycott, to-day we have to face a lot of difficulties. So the G.N.L.F. (Gorkha National Liberation Front) request all the people to extend their support to make or create a Gorkhaland in India. Thank you all.

APPENDIX C

GOVERNMENT OF WEST BENGAL

LAW DEPARTMENT
LEGISLATIVE

West Bengal Act XXIV of 1961
The West Bengal Official Language Act, 1961
(Passed by the West Bengal Legislature)

(*Assent of the Governor was first published in the Calcutta Gazette, Extraordinary, of the 11th November, 1961.*)

(11th November, 1961)

An Act to provide for the adoption of the Bengali Language as the language to be used for the official purposes of the State of West Bengal including purposes of legislation.

It is hereby enacted in the Twelfth year of the Republic of India, by the Legislature of West Bengal as follows:

1. **Short title and extent**

(1) This Act may be called the West Bengal Official Language Act, 1961.

(2) It extends to the whole of West Bengal.

2. **Language or Languages to be used for official purposes of the State**

With effect from such date, not later than two years from the date of commencement of this Act, as the State Government may, by notification in the official gazette, appoint in this behalf:

(*a*) in the three hill subdivisions of the district Darjeeling, namely, Darjeeling, Kalimpong and Kurseong, the Bengali Language and the Nepali Language, and

(*b*) elsewhere, the Bengali Language, shall be the language or languages to be used for the official purposes of the State of West Bengal referred to in the West Bengal Official Language Act, 1961.

(West Bengal Act XXIV of 1961)

(Section 3)

article 345 of the Constitution of India, and different dates may be appointed for different official purposes or for different areas in West Bengal:

Provided that the issue of any such notification shall be without prejudice to—

(*i*) the use of any language other than the Bengali Language which is authorised by or under any law for the time being in force to be used for any purpose in any of the civil or criminal courts within the State of West Bengal, and

(*ii*) the use of the English Language in the examinations conducted by the Public Service Commission, West Bengal.

3. **Bengali Language to be used in bills, etc.**

With effect from such date as the State Government may, by notification in the official gazette, appoint in this behalf, the Bengali Language shall be the language to be used—

(*a*) in bills introduced in, and Acts passed by, the Legislature of West Bengal, ordinances promulgated by the Governor of West Bengal under article 213 of the Constitution of India and rules, regulations and by-laws made by the State Government under the Constitution of India or under any law made by Parliament or the Legislature of West Bengal; and

(*b*) in notifications or orders issued by the State Government under the Constitution of India or under any law made by Parliament or the Legislature of West Bengal:

Provided that different dates may be appointed in respect of different matters referred to in clauses (*a*) and (*b*).

APPENDIX D

UNANIMOUS RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE ALL-PARTY MEETING CONVENED BY THE CHIEF MINISTER ON THE GORKHALAND MOVEMENT IN DARJEELING

This meeting unanimously holds that the Gorkhaland movement, led by Gorkha National Liberation Front is divisive, anti-people, anti-national and anti-state. This movement has done immense harm to the interest of the Nepali-speaking people during the last few months. As a result, the economy of the district of Darjeeling has been very adversely affected. This meeting condemns this agitation in strong terms.

This agitation, the meeting feels, is against the interest of the entire Nepali community of both the hills and the plains. This movement has enormously damaged the cause of the development of the hill areas of Darjeeling.

This meeting appeals to the organisers of the Gorkhaland movement to call off their agitation immediately.

This meeting calls upon the people of the district of Darjeeling and its adjoining areas to come forward to isolate the Gorkhaland agitators from the general masses of these areas.

This meeting resolves that a joint programme by all Political Parties against the Gorkhaland movement be undertaken in the entire State of West Bengal including Darjeeling. The meeting requests the Chief Minister to take initiative in this matter.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AT THE ALL-PARTY MEETING CONVENED BY THE CHIEF MINISTER, WEST BENGAL—HELD AT ROTUNDA, WRITERS' BUILDINGS, CALCUTTA ON 18 AUGUST, 1986 AT 10.30 A.M.

Ministers of Government of West Bengal present:

1. Shri Jyoti Basu, Chief Minister, West Bengal, who presided over the meeting.
2. Shri Nani Bhattacherjee
3. Shri Nirmal Bose
4. Shri Patit Paban Pathak
5. Shri Dawa Lama
6. Shri Subhash Chakraborty
7. Shri Bimalananda Mukherjee

Representatives of Political Parties present:

Sl. No.	*Name*	*Political Party represented*
1.	Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munsi ..	West Bengal Pradesh Congress Committee (I)
2.	Shri Subroto Mukherjee ..	-do-
3.	Shri Apurba Lal Mazumdar ..	-do-
4.	Shri Maimur Hossain Ansar ..	Lok Dal
5.	Shri Santimoy Chatterjee ..	-do-
6.	Shri Tapan Sikdar ..	Bharatiya Janata Party
7.	Shri Sukumar Banerjee ..	-do-
8.	Shri Prasanta Dasgupta ..	Forward Block
9.	Shri Sankar Dutta ..	-do-
10.	Shri Nikhil Das ..	Revolutionary Socialist Party
11.	Shri Biman Mitra ..	West Bengal Socialist Party
12.	Shri Sailen Adhicary ..	-do-
13.	Shri Swaraj Bandhu Bhattacharya ..	Janata Party
14.	Shri Ashok Dasgupta ..	-do-
15.	Shri Manik Mukherjee ..	Socialist Unity Centre of India
16.	Shri Sukomal Dasgupta ..	-do-
17.	Shri Biswanath Mukherjee ..	Communist Party of India
18.	Shri Gurudas Dasgupta ..	-do-
19.	Shri Arun Mitra ..	Democratic Socialist Party
20.	Shri Sunil Choudhury ..	Biplabi Bangla Congress
21.	Shri Gouranga Samanta ..	-do-
22.	Shri Ratish Bhattacharjee ..	Congress (S)
23.	Shri Himansu Das Gupta ..	-do-
24.	Shri Basanta Mukherjee ..	Revolutionary Communist Party of India
25.	Shri Biman Basu ..	Communist Party of India (Marxist)
26.	Shri Ananda Pathak (M.P.) ..	-do-

APPENDIX E

TREATY OF PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF NEPAL (1950)

The Government of India and the Government of Nepal, recognising the ancient ties which have happily existed between the two countries for centuries;

Desiring still further to strengthen and develop these ties and to perpetuate peace between the two countries;

Have resolved therefore to enter into a Treaty of Peace and Friendship with each other, and have for this purpose, appointed as their plenipotentials the following persons, namely:

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

HIS EXCELLENCY SHRI CHANDRESHWAR PRASAD NARAIN SINGH, Ambassador of India to Nepal.

THE GOVERNMENT OF NEPAL

MOHUN SHAMSHER JANG BAHADUR RANA, MAHARAJA, Prime Minister and Supreme Commander-in-Chief of Nepal.

Article I

There shall be everlasting peace and friendship between the Government of India and the Government of Nepal. The two Governments agree mutually to acknowledge and respect the complete sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of each other.

Article II

The two Governments hereby undertake to inform each of any serious friction or misunderstanding with any neighbouring State likely to cause any breach in the friendly relations subsisting between the two Governments.

Article III

In order to establish and maintain the relations referred to in Article I the two Governments agree to continue deplomatic relations with each other by means of representatives with such staff as is necessary for the due performance of their functions.

The representatives and such of their staff as may be agreed upon shall enjoy such diplomatic privileges and immunity as are customarily granted by international law on a reciprocative basis; provided that in no case shall these be less than those granted to persons of a similar status of any other State having diplomatic relations with either Government.

Article IV

The two Governments agree to appoint Consuls-General, Consuls, Vice-Consuls and other Consular agents, who shall reside in towns, ports and other places in each other's territory as may be agreed to.

Consuls-General, Consuls, Vice-Consuls and Consular agents shall be provided with exequature or other valid authorisation of their appointment. Such exequature or authorisation is liable to be withdrawn by the country which issued it, if considered necessary. The reasons for the withdrawal shall be indicated wherever possible.

The persons mentioned above shall enjoy on a reciprocal basis all the rights, privileges, exemptions and immunities that are accorded to persons of corresponding status of any other State.

Article V

The Government of Nepal shall be free to import, from or through the territory of India, arms, ammunition or war-like materials and equipment necessary for the security of Nepal. The procedure for giving effect to this arrangement shall be worked out by the two Governments acting in consultation.

Article VI

Each Government undertakes, in token of the neighbourly friendship between India and Nepal, to give the nationals of the other, in its territory, national treatment with regard to participation in industrial and economic development of such territory and to the grant of concessions and contracts relating to such development.

Article VII

The Government of India and Nepal agree to grant, on a reciprocal basis, to the nationals of one country in the territories of the other same previleges in the matter of residence, ownership of property, participation in trade and commerce, movement and other previleges of a similar nature.

Article VIII

So far as matters dealt with herein are concerned, the Treaty cancels all previous treaties, agreements, and engagements entered into on behalf of India between the British Government and the Government of Nepal.

Article IX

This Treaty shall come into force from the date of signature of both Governments.

Article X

This Treaty shall remain in force until it is terminated by either party by giving one year's notice.

Done in duplicate at Kathmandu this 31st day of July, 1950.

Sd/- Chandreshwar Prasad Narain Singh
For the Government of India

Sd/- Mohun Shamsher Jang Bahadur Rana
For the Government of Nepal

APPENDIX F

LINGUISTIC BREAKDOWN OF THE POPULATION OF DARJEELING: 1971

(Percentages given in parentheses)

	LINGUISTIC GROUP					
	Bengali	Gorkhali/ Nepali	Lepcha	Bhutia	Others	Total
Sub-division						
Sadar	1,688 (0·69)	2,27,836 (92·92)	1,193 (0·49)	970 (0·39)	13,520 (5·51)	2,45,207
Kalimpong	1,964 (1·46)	1,18,163 (87·83)	8,330 (6·19)	2,859 (2·13)	3,222 (2·39)	1,34,538
Kurseong	2,130 (2·13)	87,284 (87·08)	1,135 (1·13)	90 (0·09)	9,594 (9·57)	1,00,233
Siliguri	1,56,567 (51·88)	23,363 (7·74)	415 (0·14)	54 (0 01)	1,21,400 (40·23)	3,01,799
TOTAL:	1,62,349 (20·77)	4,56,646 (58·41)	11,073 (1·42)	3,973 (0·50)	1,47,736 (18·90)	7,81,777

BREAKDOWN OF NEPALI POPULATION IN INDIA: 1971

	Number	%
India	14,19,875	100·00
West Bengal	6,15,544	43·35
Rest of India	8,04,331	56·65
Darjeeling District	4,56,646	32·16
Hill Area of Darjeeling District	4,33,283	30·52
Jalpaiguri	1,28,765	9·69
West Bengal (Districts other than Darjeeling and Jalpaiguri)	30,133	2·12
Outside Darjeeling Hill Area	9,86,592	69·48

APPENDIX G

SELECTED INDICATORS OF DEVELOPMENT FOR DARJEELING AND OTHER NORTH BENGAL DISTRICTS

Indicators	State average	Darjeeling	Jalpaiguri	Cooch Bihar	West Dinajpur	Malda
1. Area (% of W.B.)	100·00	3·55	7·02	3·82	6·04	4·21
2. Population (% of W.B. in 1981)	100·00	1·88	4·06	3·25	4·41	3·72
3. Density (per sq. km.)	615	325	356	523	449	544
4. Proportion of cultivated area to total area	64·94	32·26	53·77	80·16	89·03	82·97
5. Cultivable area for agricultural worker (that is cultivators and labourers together)—hectares	0·80	0·94	1·22	0·84	1·07	0·86
6. Index of agricultural production in 1982-83 with 1971-72=100	96·14	133·48	107·29	94·24	94·43	117·16
7. Percentage of workers	30·22	36·88	33·72	29·80	32·08	30·26
8. Population per bank (in thousand)	20	14	27	34	41	25
9. Literacy rate	40·9	42·5	29·9	30·00	26·90	23·10
10. Medical Institutions (% of W.B.)	100·00	4·20	5·39	3·55	4·03	3·62
11. Radio (% of W.B.)	100·00	3·18	1·35	2·79	0·60	0·70
12. Television (% of W.B.)	100·00	0·30	0·17	0·30	0·05	0·07
13. Percentage of cross-breed cattle	9·66	64·59	1·47	8·97	5·52	8·17
14. Milk production (% of W.B.)	100·00	4·58	3·88	3·03	3·51	4·25
15. Agricultural enterprises (% of W.B.)	100·00	5·06	3·10	1·08	5·19	9·19
16. No. of non-agricultural enterprises (% of W.B.)	100·00	2·09	3·34	2·94	3·23	2·82

APPENDIX H

POPULATION GROWTHS IN DARJEELING DISTRICT

Year	Population	Year	Population
1891	2,29,914	1941	3,76,369
1901	2,49,117	1951	4,45,260
1911	2,65,550	1961	6,24,640
1921	2,82,748	1971	7,81,777
1931	3,19,635	1981	10,24,269

ಗ್ರಂಥಾಲಯ
ಕನ್ನಡ ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾಲಯ - ಹಂಪಿ
ವಿದ್ಯಾರಣ್ಯ

ವರ್ಗೀಕರಣ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ : 954: 14 IND

ಪರಿಗ್ರಹಣ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ : 107857

ಪುಸ್ತಕವನ್ನು ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಲಾಗಿರುವ ದಿನದಂದು ಅಥವಾ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುನ್ನ ಹಿಂದಿರುಗಿಸಬೇಕು. ತಡವಾದ ಪ್ರತಿದಿನಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಯಮಾನುಸಾರ ದಂಡ ಶುಲ್ಕ ವಿಧಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು.

TRA EELING

The he Hill of
Darjeelir nts of its
Governm e Sikkim-
putte Ra Darjeeling
to the Ea r, east of
the Balas ahanuddi
Rivers.

AKSHARA GRANTHALAYA
ACC.NO. 107857

Published by the Director of Information, Government of West Bengal and Printed at Sree Saraswaty Press Ltd. (A W. B. Govt. Undertaking), Calcutta-700 009. 15,000+15,000/9.10.86